

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association.
For the present, THE QUARTERLY will be published in two DOUBLE numbers in April and October;
the times of publication of THE REVIEW are variable under war conditions

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

EDITED BY

M. PLATNAUER, M.A., B.Litt., Brasenose College, Oxford

W. K. C. GUTHRIE, M.A., Peterhouse, Cambridge

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

Prof. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., F.R.S. (Chairman), representing the Cambridge Philological Society

J. G. BARRINGTON-WARD, M.A. (Hon. Treas.) Prof. J. F. DORSON, M.A.
Prof. H. A. ORMEROD, M.A., F.S.A. F. H. SANDRACH, M.A. (Hon. Sec.) } Representing the Council of the
Prof. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A. } Classical Association

E. A. BARBER, M.A., F.R.S., representing the Oxford Philological Society

With the co-operation of Prof. E. K. RAND, Harvard University, Prof. J. L. MICHIE, University of Queensland,
and Prof. B. D. MERITT, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton

Volume XXXVII

JULY—OCT. 1943

Numbers 3, 4

CONTENTS

POLYBIUS ON THE ROMAN CONSTITUTION. F. W. WALBANK	73
TACITEA. G. B. A. FLETCHER	90
ΗΡΑΚΛΗΣ ΑΒΟΝΤΟΦΟΝΟΣ (Theocr. <i>Id.</i> xxv). A. S. F. GOW	93
SOME CUCURBITACEAE IN LATIN LITERATURE. F. A. TODD	101

OXFORD: AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

LONDON NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE

HUMPHREY MILFORD: OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Price for single numbers, 4s. net (4s. 2d. post free); for double numbers, 8s. net (8s. 4d. post free). Yearly subscription 16s. post free; U.S.A. \$3.40. Combined yearly subscription for THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and THE CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. post free; U.S.A., \$5.32

The Loeb Classical Library

Edited by

† T. E. PAGE, C.H., Litt.D.

E. CAPPEL, PH.D., LL.D.

W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt.D.

L. A. FOST, M.A.

E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A.

Founded by JAMES LOEB

Each volume Foolscap 8vo, 400-700 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 10s. net; leather, 12s. 6d. net

A series of Greek and Latin Texts with English Translations on the opposite page. The series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—*Times Literary Supplement*.

NEW VOLUMES, 1943

LATIN

367 LIVY. Thirteen volumes. Vol. VII, Books XXVI and XXVII. Translated by F. G. Moore.

GREEK

364 DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS. ROMAN ANTIQUITIES. Seven volumes; Vol. IV, Books VI 49—and, and VII. Translated by E. Cary.

365 JOSEPHUS. Nine volumes; Vol. VII. ANTIQUITIES, Books XII-XIV. Translated by R. Marcus.

366 ARISTOTLE. 'GENERATION OF ANIMALS'. Translated by A. L. Peck.

Machine or Mind? (an introduction to the Loeb Classical Library). Free together with Descriptive Prospectus, &c.

WILLIAM HEINEMANN, LTD.

Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

CLASSICAL BOOKS

As of all subjects we hold a *very large stock* of Classical Books both new and second-hand. Owing to paper restrictions we are not able to issue our usual catalogues but we will gladly answer all inquiries. We are anxious to purchase good Classical Books as well as good books in every field of Literature, Science and Arts



W. HEFFER AND SONS LTD
4 PETTY CURY, CAMBRIDGE

LARGE DEPTS. FOR BOOKS ON ART,
POLITICS, EDUCATION, RELIGION,
ETC.

FOYLES
+ BOOKSELLERS TO THE WORLD +

New and secondhand Books
on every subject

Stock of nearly three million
volumes

BOOKS BOUGHT

Join the Classics Book Club!
Members buy world-famous
books (published at 7/6, 10/6,
and 12/6 for ONLY 2/6)

119-125 Charing Cross Road
London, W.C.2

Telephone:
Gerrard 5660 (16 lines)

Open 9-6 including
Saturday

FOR n
theory
been
succes
writes
Polyb
sent t
book
own v
hints
a revi
over a

Cu
the ap
book
more c
studie
recent
with i
merits
discuss
attent
its ina
the Cu
and do

Me
In 192
tain th
publis
La-Ro

Note.
Momigl
heim, to
and crit
ever, as

¹ K.
Aemilia
lished
1935. E
Taeger,
108, the
piece, a
successi

² Riv

³ Ston

Encic. i

The oth

Die Th

4590.9

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

JULY—OCTOBER 1943

POLYBIUS ON THE ROMAN CONSTITUTION

I

FOR many years it has been recognized that serious contradictions exist in Polybius' theory of the Roman constitution, as he expounds it in Book VI. The position has been summarized in a review of a recent publication which attempts, not very successfully, to dispose of these inconsistencies.¹ 'The only point of controversy', writes De Sanctis,² 'can be whether these contradictory elements were innate in Polybius' political philosophy and in his judgement on Rome, or whether they represent two successive stages in the historian's thought, and two successive drafts of the book itself, which either the author or the editor failed to co-ordinate.' De Sanctis' own view is, of course, the second;³ and indeed, ever since 1902, when Cuntz, following hints thrown out by La-Roche, Meyer, and Susemihl, first propounded the theory of a revised edition of Polybius' *Staatstheorie*, it has exercised a dominating influence over all work on the subject.

Cuntz himself attributed only a handful of passages, in which Polybius foretold the approaching decline of the Roman constitution,⁴ to a second working-over of the book under the influence of the events of 133. But subsequent investigation led to more drastic dissection; and in 1913 there appeared two simultaneous but independent studies by Svoboda and Laqueur, which have controlled the main lines followed by recent work.⁵ Unfortunately the unacceptable character of much of Laqueur's book, with its attempt to isolate successive editions of the *Histories*, served to obscure the merits of what he had to say on Book VI; and De Sanctis' concise and very valuable discussion in his *Storia dei Romani*,⁶ based largely on Laqueur, has scarcely had the attention it merited, at least in Germany, where it was perhaps overlooked owing to its inaccessibility at the time of its publication. At any rate, the most recent work in the Cuntz tradition, that of Kornemann,⁷ depends in important respects on Svoboda, and does not even mention De Sanctis.

Meanwhile the unitarian position had not been surrendered without a struggle. In 1922 and 1935 works were published by Taeger and Bilz which attempted to maintain the unity of Polybius vi against its critics; and in 1936 an important paper was published by L. Zancan, which, although in some ways a return to the position of La-Roche, nevertheless advanced the question considerably.⁸ In 1857 Paul La-Roche

Note. This paper has been read by Dr. A. Momigliano, Dr. Piero Treves, and Dr. F. Heichelheim, to all of whom I owe valuable suggestions and criticism: they must not be regarded, however, as necessarily accepting my conclusions.

¹ K. Bilz, *Die Politik des P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus*, (Würzb. Stud. Heft vii, 1936): published originally as a Würzburg dissertation, 1935. Bilz, pp. 9 ff., develops the thesis of F. Taeger, *Die Archäologie des Polybios* (1922), 108, that Polybius vi was written in a single piece, and has no inconsistencies or traces of successive versions.

² Riv. Fil. lxxv, 1937, 83-4.

³ *Storia dei Romani*, iii. 1 (1916), 205-9; *Encic. ital.* xxvii (1935), s.v. 'Polibio', p. 629. The other alternative is accepted by P. Zillig, *Die Theorie von der gemischten Verfassung in*

ihrer literarischen Entwicklung im Altertum usw. (Diss. Würzburg, 1915), 54-5 (a reference which I owe to Taeger, op. cit. 108, n. 20).

⁴ O. Cuntz, *Polybius und sein Werk* (1902), 37-42. The passages were vi. 9. 10-14; 10. 7 (*ἐνὶ πολὺ* inserted); 51. 3-8; 57.

⁵ K. Svoboda, *Hermes*, lxxii, 1913, 55-83 (particularly 472-8): 'Die Abfassungszeit des Geschichtswerkes des Polybios'; R. Laqueur, *Polybios* (1913), 223-49 (cf. also *Phil. Woch.* 1924, col. 336, reviewing Taeger, op. cit., and *Hermes*, lxxv, 1930, 164-6).

⁶ See above, n. 3.

⁷ E. Kornemann, *Philol.* lxxxvi, 1931, 169-84: 'Zum Staatsrecht des Polybios'.

⁸ L. Zancan, *Rend. Ist. Lombardo*, lxix, 1936, 499-512: 'Dottrina delle costituzioni e decadenza politica in Polibio'.

had published an excellent little pamphlet,¹ in which he traced certain apparent contradictions in Book VI,² and explained them as deriving from the character of Polybius, a man prone to hesitation between opposite principles and incapable of reconciling his ideal constitution with the picture presented by his own unprejudiced observation of the Roman State. Similarly Zancan now argued that the fundamental contradiction between the theory of the mixed constitution and that of circular political development, or *anacyclosis*, did not correspond to any change in Polybius' judgement on the Roman State, but simply to his failure to co-ordinate two inconsistent theories, which he had taken over from his predecessors in the attempt to answer two distinct problems, viz. (1) why had Rome been so phenomenally successful? (2) what was the cause of certain contemporary signs of decadence? The revolutionary aspect of Zancan's treatment lay, however, in his definition of the contradiction presented by the two theories contained in Book VI. Hitherto it had been commonly assumed that Polybius' view of the Roman constitution as a mixture of the three simple forms, and so free from the tendency to deteriorate, which was inseparable from these, also implied its immortality; while the *anacyclosis* was adopted by him to explain certain indications of approaching decay. This view Zancan completely reversed; the 'mixed constitution', he insisted, was only relatively stable, whereas the *anacyclosis*, by reason of its schematic, circular form, left no place for decadence. Herein lay the contradiction between the two conceptions: but it was a contradiction innate in Polybius' own mind and philosophy. Not *Quellenforschung*, but psychological analysis was the clue to the problem.

Now it cannot be denied that Zancan's insistence on psychology has been fruitful; and his argument deserves close study. As he observes, the closed circle of the *anacyclosis*, by which one constitutional form is resolved into another *κατὰ φύσιν*, until eventually the cycle returns to the original form, has no place in it, *logically*, for the idea of decadence;³ on the other hand, in three places at least⁴ it is made very clear that the mixed constitution is only *relatively* stable. What then of those passages which envisage the decline of the Roman constitution, and which Laqueur and Svoboda, and their successors, had connected with the theory of *anacyclosis* (vi. 9. 12-14 (the conclusion of the description of the *anacyclosis*); 51. 3-8; 57)? They are, Zancan replies quite correctly, inconsistent with the *anacyclosis* theory. What vi. 9. 12-14 states is that the Roman constitution has been formed and has grown up naturally (*κατὰ φύσιν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἔχουσιν τὴν σύστασιν καὶ τὴν αὐξήσιν*) and will undergo a natural decline and change to its contrary (*κατὰ φύσιν ἔξεω καὶ τὴν εἰς τὰναντία μεταβολήν*); and similarly in 51. 3-8 and in 57 it is because all bodies or states have their periods first of growth, then of prime, and finally of decay *κατὰ φύσιν*, and because

¹ Paul La-Roche, *Charakteristik des Polybios* (1857), 18 ff.; particularly p. 31 and n. 2.

² La-Roche pointed out the seeming inconsistency between vi. 9. 13 (linked with 51. 4), in which Polybius envisages the natural decline of the Roman constitution, and 18. 5 f., which describes the equilibrium of the mixed state; and between the definition of the Roman State as a mixed constitution and 51. 5 f., where the Roman success against Carthage is attributed to the predominance of the Senate. La-Roche's view appears almost unchanged in R. Heinze, *Hermes*, lix, 1924, 87 (= p. 160 in *Vom Geiste des Römerturns*, ed. E. Burck, 1938, pp. 142-70).

³ Op. cit. 504-5. This is speaking *logically* and

theoretically. In practice, as we shall see, Polybius maintained his own political preferences even within the closed circle.

⁴ viz. 10. 11 where Lycurgus is said to have preserved freedom at Sparta *πλείστον ὥν ἡμεῖς ἴσμεν χρόνον*; 10. 14 where the Roman, like the Spartan constitution, is *κάλιστον σύστημα τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς πολιτειῶν*; 11. 1 where the former is said to have been *κάλιστον καὶ τέλειον ἐν τοῖς Ἀντιβατικοῖς καιροῖς*. Cf. also 10. 7: the mixed constitution remains in a state of equilibrium *ἐπὶ πολὺ* (cf. Taeger, op. cit. 112). See further Bilz, op. cit. 10, who anticipated Zancan in drawing attention to these passages.

Rome
she too

In
cally w
in 51. 3
Roman
constit
Polybi
It was
constit
as pro
the ap
To
theory
which
That F
but in
Sparta
that cl
of con
constit
Zancan
says th
(§ 1), i
checks
excess
analys
itself a
forms.
finely
believe
the pro
like the
Ho
Polybi
places
to the
tion of
of the

¹ Cur
iii. 1. 20

² Zar

³ e.g.

φύσιν;

9. 14; 5

is not a

⁴ See

iii. 1. 2

that 11.

to reco

anacycl

jettison

stitution

Rome is above all others a state whose development is *κατὰ φύσιν* (cf. 9. 13-14), that she too must ultimately decline.

In fact it was nothing new to demonstrate that these passages did not fit in logically with the theory of *anacyclosis*; Cuntz¹ had already analysed the inconsistency in 51. 3-8, and explained it as an attempt to link Polybius' later conviction that the Roman constitution was in decay with his earlier belief in the stability of the mixed constitution. What Zancan did was to put his finger on the equivocation under which Polybius slid over, almost imperceptibly, from the one order of thought to the other. It was in the criterion of *φύσις*.² Both the *anacyclosis* and the conception of the constitution as an organism, subject to growth, prime, and decay, are alike regarded as processes *κατὰ φύσιν*. The phrase is constantly used of either;³ and it serves to hide the approximation of two different conceptions of political development.

To have shown this was a great step forward. But Zancan had still to refute the theory of two successive editions of Polybius vi. For this he relied on the three passages which imply that even the mixed state cannot last for ever (10. 11; 10. 14; 11. 1).⁴ That Polybius' words in these passages contain this implication there can be no doubt; but in any case it was self-evident. In view of the irrefutable fact that Lycurgan Sparta no longer existed, it would have been idle for Polybius, once he had introduced that classical example of a mixed constitution,⁵ to pretend to maintain that this type of constitution was immortal. And so, logically, it must follow that the Roman constitution would some day also come to an end. In ch. 18. 1-8 (a passage which Zancan ignores) this doctrine appears to be contradicted; but in fact all that Polybius says there is that the mixed constitution is the best that can possibly be attained (§ 1), irresistible in its foreign policy (§ 4), and by reason of its delicate system of checks and balances adequate to maintain the *status quo* against all tendency to excess on the part of any of its constituent elements (§§ 5-8). But Polybius is here analysing the *mechanics* of its stability—the means by which, so long as it maintains itself at its prime, it avoids the deterioration peculiar to the simple constitutional forms. There is no contradiction, fundamentally, with the view that ultimately this finely balanced organism, like all others, will decline *κατὰ φύσιν*.⁶ Hence Polybius believes⁷ quite consistently that, though the difficulties are greater, nevertheless with the proper effort it is possible to foresee the future of the Roman (mixed) constitution, like that of other states.

However—and this is the important point—it is not for its ultimate decline that Polybius is interested in the mixed constitution, but for its stability. In one or two places he may betray the fact that *logically* the mixed constitution also is subject to the laws of nature. But the parts of his discussion which stress the *organic* conception of the State (growth, prime, decadence) are all closely connected with the theory of the *anacyclosis*. In 9. 12-14 he is completing his account of that theory; in 51. 3-8

¹ Cuntz, op. cit. 40-1; cf. De Sanctis, *Storia*, iii. 1. 206.

² Zancan, op. cit. 508.

³ e.g. for *anacyclosis*, 4. 7 *φυσικῶς*; 4. 9 *κατὰ φύσιν*; 4. 11; 4. 13; for the 'organic' idea, 9. 13; 9. 14; 51. 4; 57. 1 *ἡ τῆς φύσεως ἀνάγκη*. But this is not an exhaustive list.

⁴ See above, p. 74, n. 4. De Sanctis (*Storia*, iii. 1. 207; cf. Svoboda, op. cit. 474-5) argues that 11. 1 is one of the passages introduced later to reconcile the mixed constitution with the *anacyclosis*; on this view Polybius, having jettisoned the conception of the Roman constitution as unchangeable, puts its acme at the

time of the Hannibalic War. However, a reference to the Hannibalic War seems wholly in place here, since it is in connexion with the Roman recovery after Cannae that Polybius sets out to discuss the Roman constitution at all (vi. 2. 4 f.). Kornemann seems (op. cit. 170, n. 8) to have ignored this passage, when he claims ch. 11 as one which 'betont vor allem die Stabilität der römischen Mischverfassung'.

⁵ Cf. Aristot. *Pol.* ii. 6. 1265^b, 33 f.

⁶ This point was already seen by Bilz, op. cit. 10, and approved by E. Lincke, *Phil. Woch.* 1936, col. 1168.

⁷ Polyb. vi. 3. 3; see below, p. 80.

Carthage is already in the hands of the *δῆμος*, while the Roman acme is identified not with the mixed constitution but with the predominance of the Senate (51. 6); finally 57, as Zancan admits,¹ is full of phraseology which closely suggests the last stages of the *anacyclosis*. In short, when he was considering the mixed constitution Polybius was not concerned with the question of ultimate deterioration. As a practical politician he saw no signs of this before 150,² and (as I shall have reason to stress below) Polybius was first and foremost a man of action, who adopted theories to explain what he had observed. 'Vuole essere osservato subito', remarks Zancan with justice,³ 'che Polibio non è, nè pretende di essere, pensatore rigoroso.' Accordingly, we must seek the clues to his thought in the association of ideas which his book actually reveals (*viz.* the association of the mixed constitution with the idea of relative permanence) rather than in such conclusions as his theories may warrant when pressed beyond the point at which he normally left them (*viz.* the conclusion that the idea of the mixed constitution is logically compatible with that of decline).

The first criticism of Zancan's theory is, then, that by forcing Polybius' ideas farther than he himself developed them he seeks paradoxically to associate the idea of decline with the mixed constitution. And as the corollary of this he leaves no place at all in his scheme for the *anacyclosis*. To Zancan the explanation of Roman success lies in the mixed constitution; and the contemporary signs of Roman disintegration spring from the fact that it is the nature of all organisms and constitutions to undergo a process of growth, acme, and decline.⁴ If the sixth book of Polybius was composed in a single piece, no further explanation was required; and the intricate scheme of circular development, elaborated in chapters 4-9, but applying to none of the mixed constitutions (Carthage, Sparta, or Rome), is entirely superfluous;⁵ hence, when in 9. 12-14 Polybius asserts that the theory of the *anacyclosis* will facilitate his readers' comprehension of the future development of the Roman State, he is evidently the victim of serious (and inexplicable) mental confusion.

In fact, though Zancan's analysis of the nature of the mixed constitution successfully explains certain of the alleged inconsistencies in Book VI, it fails to explain why a single draft, composed before the destruction of Carthage in 146, should contain the idea of *anacyclosis* at all. And therefore, pursuing cautiously the lines of criticism developed since 1902, our next task will be to consider whether there is any fresh criterion which will assist in distinguishing that later layer in Polybius' theory which the 'separatists' postulate and Zancan's view denies.

II

A word in common use in Polybius is *μόναρχος* (*μοναρχία*). Usually it means 'tyrant (tyranny)'. Thus Aratus' object was to expel the Macedonians from the Peloponnese, *τὰς δὲ μοναρχίας καταλῦσαι*, and to establish in each state its *πάτριον ἐλευθερίαν* (ii. 43. 8). Somewhat earlier the *μόναρχος* of Bura had joined the Achaeans

¹ Op. cit. 507, n. 11. It is true that the approach is not entirely that of the *anacyclosis*, for reasons to be considered below (pp. 83, ff.).

² It is significant that when he undertook to discuss the Roman constitution at all, he was not originally concerned with deterioration, but solely with the explanation of Roman success; cf. iii. 2. 6; 118. 9 f.; v. 111. 10. Zancan, with his assumption of a *double* problem (see above, p. 74), ignores the clear indication of these three passages. I owe this point to Dr. Treves.

³ Op. cit. 500.

⁴ This was, of course, a commonplace by the time of Thucydides; cf. Thuc. ii. 64. 3 (Pericles' defence): *πάντα γὰρ πέφυκε καὶ ἐλασσοῦσθαι*.

⁵ Taeger, op. cit. 109 (cf. the review by V. Ehrenberg, *Hist. Zeit.* 130 (3. Folge, 34), 1924, 478) believes that the *anacyclosis* was the means by which the Roman mixed constitution grew to its ideal prime; but there is no justification in Polybius for this particular combination, which he arrives at only by a somewhat arbitrary 'reconstruction' of Polybius from Cicero's *De re publica*.

League
were m
Hermio
'Αχαῖων
209 is d
Punic V
πραγμα
where,
(xi. 13.
tyranny

In a
means
certain
τοὺς μο
lawful
adds (8
are, how
that fo
occasio

This
Book V
ment, k
καὶ τυρ
hence (4
ingly (4
volunta
reason.

neutral
not eve
μοναρχ

In c
with its
(βασιλει
cracy d
to tyra
to say
μοναρχ
certain
stitutio
neutral
From

μόναρχ
favour
to that

¹ He
offending
ideas is
monarch

² On
haeuser'

not so co
³ Sim

League (ii. 41. 14); and on the death of Demetrius II οἱ ἐν τῇ Πελοποννήσῳ μόναρχοι were much cast down (ii. 44. 3), and very soon Aristomachus of Argos, Xenon of Hermione, and Cleonymus of Phlius, ἀποθέμενοι τὰς μοναρχίας ἐκωνώνησαν τῆς τῶν Ἀχαιῶν δημοκρατίας (ii. 44. 6). The outrageous behaviour of Philip V at Argos in 209 is described as μοναρχικώτερος (x. 26. 2);¹ and similarly at the time of the Third Punic War certain of Rome's critics asserted that her policy savoured of μοναρχικῆς πραγματουσίας rather than of the principles of a civilized state (xxxvi. 9. 11). Elsewhere, discussing the behaviour of mercenaries under democracy and tyranny (xi. 13. 5-8), the historian equates μόναρχος with τύραννος; and in another passage the tyranny of Molpagoras of Cius is referred to as μοναρχικὴν ἐξουσίαν (xv. 21. 2).²

In all these examples μόναρχος has the meaning of 'tyrant'. But sometimes it means simply a 'monarch' in a general sense.³ Thus in viii. 8. 4 Polybius criticizes certain writers who have omitted any reference to the Messenian events διὰ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς μονάρχους εὐνοίαν, viz. autocratic rulers in general and particularly Philip V, the lawful king of Macedon; and a little later, in reference to Philip II and Philip V, he adds (8. 7) that one ought not to revile nor extol τοὺς μονάρχους falsely. Such examples are, however, comparatively few, and Polybius' usage may be summed up by saying that for him μόναρχος usually means 'tyrant' in a pejorative sense, but that very occasionally the word is used in the neutral sense of 'monarch'.

This is the normal usage, and it is that found in a large number of passages in Book VI. Thus in 3. 9, discussing the corruptions of the three pure forms of government, kingship (βασιλεία), aristocracy, and democracy, Polybius speaks of μοναρχικὰς καὶ τυραννικὰς . . . πολιτείας, which are very different from the kingship they resemble; hence (3. 10) the eagerness of μόναρχοι to appropriate the name of βασιλεία.⁴ Accordingly (4. 2), οὕτε πᾶσαν δῆπου μοναρχίαν εὐθέως βασιλείαν ῥητέον, but only that which is voluntarily accepted by the subjects and where they are governed by an appeal to reason. That μοναρχία is here used as the equivalent of 'tyranny', and not in its neutral sense, is clear from the next section (4. 3), where Polybius goes on to say that not every oligarchy can be considered an aristocracy; and further, in 4. 6 he defines μοναρχία as the specific corruption of βασιλεία.

In chapter 10 Polybius again speaks of the three simple forms of constitution, each with its own vice engendered in it and inseparable from it; and again for kingship (βασιλεία) it is ὁ μοναρχικὸς λεγόμενος τρόπος, for aristocracy oligarchy, and for democracy ὁ θηριώδης καὶ χειροκρατικός. Here the μοναρχικὸς τρόπος clearly corresponds to tyranny. But in 11. 11, where Polybius speaks of the inability of even a native to say with certainty whether the Roman system was aristocratic, democratic, ἢ μοναρχικόν, the word appears to be used in a neutral, or even approving sense. From certain points of view, Polybius adds (12. 9), one may pronounce the Roman constitution to be μοναρχικὸν ἀπλῶς καὶ βασιλικόν; again the sense is favourable or at least neutral.

From these examples it is clear that in Book VI, as elsewhere, Polybius uses μόναρχος normally in the sense of 'tyrant', but also occasionally as a neutral or even favourable term for a monarch in general.⁵ In short, his usage in this book corresponds to that elsewhere in the *Histories*.

¹ He behaved with ἀσέλγεια and παρανομία, offending τοὺς μετρίους ἄνδρας; the context of ideas is that of the 'tyrant', not the 'legitimate monarch'.

² On the use of τύραννος (τυραννίς) Schweighaeuser's index is inadequate; but it is clearly not so common in Polybius as μόναρχος.

³ Similarly in Aristot. *Pol.* v. 10. 1310^b, 1 f.,

βασιλεία and τυραννίς are the two forms of the neutral μοναρχία.

⁴ Was he perhaps thinking of Nabis, to the Achaeans a tyrant, to others a king? Cf. *Syll.*³ 584 (*IG.* xi. 4. 716); *IG.* v. 1. 885.

⁵ It is worth noting that the only two cases in this book where μοναρχικώτερος has its favourable or neutral sense (11. 11 and 12. 9)—μόναρχος

But we have yet to consider the use of the word in chapters 4-9 or, more correctly, in the section 4. 7-9. 14. Here, where Polybius is describing the dynamics of the *anacyclosis*, his usage is somewhat different. Having stated in 4. 6 that there are not three forms, but *six* (including the corruptions *μοναρχία*, oligarchy, and ochlocracy), he goes on to say that the first of these to arise *ἀκατασκευῶς καὶ φυσικῶς* is *μοναρχία* (4. 7). The next form to follow and spring up out of this *μετὰ κατασκευῆς καὶ διορθώσεως* is *βασίλειά* (4. 7); and this in turn changes into *τὰ συμφυῆ κακὰ, λέγω δ' εἰς τυραννίδα*.¹ Next come aristocracy, oligarchy, democracy, and ochlocracy in turn; we need not trace the process in detail. But lest there should be any doubt as to whether Polybius' meaning has been correctly indicated, it may be noted that when he proceeds, a little later, to analyse the series in full detail, and to trace the process by which each change is effected *κατὰ φύσιν*, the first form of human organization, in which men herded together like animals, following the lead of the strongest and bravest, so that the ruler's strength is the sole limit to his power, is again termed *μοναρχία* (5. 9). When men conceived ideas of sociability and companionship, *τοῦτ' ἀρχὴ βασιλείας φέται* (5. 10: process analysed in ch. 6).² Subsequently, Polybius continues (ch. 7), there ensues a deterioration, by which *ἐγένετο ἐκ τῆς βασιλείας τυραννίς*. The rest of the *anacyclosis* then follows, ending in ochlocracy and chaos, in which people, now become savages again, find a *δεσπότην καὶ μόναρχον*; and the process begins anew.

In this section *μόναρχος* has acquired a new sense. *μοναρχία* is here the stage in the *anacyclosis* preceding *βασίλειά*, while *τυραννίς* follows it. In short, the *anacyclosis* is a succession not of *six* forms (to which Polybius refers in 4. 6: *γένη μὲν ἕξ εἶναι ῥητέον πολιτειῶν*), but of *seven*. This distinction between monarchy and tyranny has been ignored by most scholars who have recently studied this book,³ though it was clear to La-Rochette who distinguished *μοναρχία*, the 'Naturstaat' based on *ισχύς*, from the first 'Rechtsstaat', *βασίλειά*, based on *δικαιοσύνη*, which grew out of it. Nevertheless, *μοναρχία* is an essential stage in Polybius' *anacyclosis*, closing the otherwise unbridgeable gap between the chaos of ochlocracy and the reasoned government of *βασίλειά*; with *six* state forms the *anacyclosis* simply does not function. Neglect of this vital link of *μοναρχία* is the fruit of excessive concentration on the three *ὄρθαι*

is nowhere so used—are in descriptions of the mixed constitution, where the possibility of the deterioration of the simple form could not arise, and therefore only the three main forms needed to be considered. Even so, in 12. 9 Polybius has added the defining words *καὶ βασιλικόν*. A possible reason for this is suggested below (p. 84, n. 2).

¹ It is particularly regrettable that Paton in the Loeb edition should at this point have translated *μεταβαλλούσης δὲ ταύτης* (antecedent *βασίλειά*) by 'Monarchy first changes . . .', thus introducing a double error and confusion.

² The analysis ends (6. 12) with the words: *καὶ δὴ τῷ τοιοῦτῳ τρόπῳ βασιλεὺς ἐκ μόναρχου λαμβάνει γινόμενος κτλ.*

³ I will give a single example, *tanti nominis causa*. De Sanctis, *Encic. ital.*, loc. cit., states that Polybius vi contains two contradictory theories, that of the mixed constitution and that of the circular development: both of these presuppose *six* constitutional forms. Taeger, op. cit. 27, on the other hand, makes the distinction

between monarchy and *basileia*, but without seeing its importance for the problem of composition; and A. Menzel, *Wien. Sitz.-ber.* (Phil.-hist. Klasse), 216. 1 (1936), 195, n. 1, asks (without answering) what type of *monarchia* is meant by Polybius as the form of government succeeding to ochlocracy (9. 9). This question touches the root of the matter. Menzel envisages the three alternatives—monarch, *basileus*, and tyrant. But it is difficult to believe that the *basileus*, whose rule is associated with *συντροφία*, *συνήθεια*, and the ideas of goodness and justice, is here to be equated with the *δεσπότης καὶ μόναρχος*, ruling over perfect savages (*ἀποτεθριώμενον πάλιν*); and if the tyrant is meant, we reduce the number of forms in the cycle from six to five and upset the whole scheme of degeneration. In short, there can be little doubt that the *μόναρχος* of the constitution which *πάλιν εἰς αὐτὰ καταντᾷ* (9. 16) is the same as the *μόναρχος* from which the cycle began (4. 7; 5. 9). Cf. R. von Scala, *Die Studien des Polybios* i (1890), 138.

⁴ Op. cit. 20.

πολιτεῖ
detaile

Unt
langua
anacyc
When
best of
εἶδος ἄ
out of
(8. 2).
tyrann
the βα
think,
not lik
is a sp
the su
carried
(ii. 3. 8
the fan
politic

In a
two. I
a speci
in the
in the
Polybi
sion of
4. 6. 1
theory
and at
might
other p

The
tains t
that th
ginning
the hy
diction
began
Zancar
middle

¹ For
technic
Les asse
passim.

² The
double
τὴν π
probabl
ment to

πολιτεῖαι and their three related παρεκβάσεις, and not enough attention to Polybius' detailed description of the actual dynamics of the μεταβολή.

Unfortunately, to demand complete consistency in Polybius' use of technical language is to invite disappointment.¹ In the very middle of his account of the *anacyclosis* he twice uses μοναρχία or μόναρχος in its non-technical sense of 'tyrant'. When the behaviour of the tyrant became intolerable, the people combined with the best of their leaders (the future aristocrats) and τὸ μὲν τῆς βασιλείας καὶ μοναρχίας εἶδος ἄρδην ἀναιρεῖτο, τὸ δὲ τῆς ἀριστοκρατίας αὐθις ἀρχὴν ἐλάμβανε καὶ γένεσιν (8. 1); and out of gratitude to τοῖς καταλύσασιν τοὺς μονάρχους, they make them their leaders (8. 2). Here the fall of the tyranny is described as the fall of the kingship and the tyranny together, presumably because the tyrant is regarded as a corrupt form of the βασιλεὺς. But for τύραννος Polybius has written μόναρχος. Why? Primarily, I think, for the simple reason that he found technicalities irksome, and where he was not likely to be misunderstood would tend to dispense with them. But here there is a special as well as a general explanation. In describing the expulsion of tyrants the successor and admirer of Aratus was on well-trodden ground. Aratus had carried out a persistent campaign, trying wherever possible τὰς μοναρχίας καταλύσαι (ii. 3. 8: quoted above). And so here Polybius writes τοῖς καταλύσασιν τοὺς μονάρχους: the familiar event has conjured up the familiar phrase. The stylist and the Achaean politician have combined to catch the political theorist unawares.

In any case, this exception does not affect the points I wish to make; and these are two. First, inside the chapters 4. 7-9. 14, the word μόναρχος (μοναρχία) is found in a special, technical sense, which occurs nowhere else either in Book VI or elsewhere in the *Histories*; and as a corollary to this, the conception of the 'monarch' developed in these chapters is quite isolated, and without any influence on the remainder of Polybius' sociological treatise. Secondly, the *anacyclosis* is described here as a succession of seven constitutional forms, not six, as is claimed in the neighbouring passage, 4. 6. Together, these two considerations seem to me conclusive of the fact that the theory of the *anacyclosis*, as described in 4. 7-9. 14, was conceived at a *different* time, and at a *later* time than the bulk of Book VI; otherwise these two remarkable features might be expected to find some reflection instead of the starkest contradiction in other parts of the discussion.²

III

This conclusion supports the general opinion that the sixth book of Polybius contains two separate strands, written at different times. And it will also be observed that the analysis of Polybius' use of μόναρχος has led us to fix upon 4. 7 as the beginning of the later insertion which describes the process of *anacyclosis*. This confirms the hypothesis of Laqueur, who also placed the break at this point,³ and is in contradiction to that of De Sanctis, who began the section at 3. 1,⁴ and Kornemann, who began it at 3. 9 (καὶ μὴν).⁵ The latter view has already been disposed of by both Zancan and Mesk,⁶ who point out that Kornemann's division splits Polybius in the middle of a continuous argument, and what is virtually a μὲν . . . δέ construction.

¹ For the truth of this, as it concerns *political* technicalities, see A. Aymard's notable study, *Les assemblées de la confédération achaienne* (1938), *passim*.

² There is one possible exception. In 3. 9 the double expression μοναρχικὰς καὶ τυραννικὰς ἥδη τινὰς τεθεάμεθα πολιτείας (see above, p. 77) probably represents a slight attempt at adjustment to a terminology more strictly in accord-

ance with that of the *anacyclosis* passage, which begins a chapter later. I regard it as probable, therefore, that the words καὶ τυραννικὰς were added at the same time as ch. 4. 7-9. 14.

³ Laqueur, *op. cit.* 245.

⁴ *Storia*, iii. 1. 208.

⁵ Kornemann, *op. cit.* 178.

⁶ Zancan, *op. cit.*, 503 and n. 3; J. Mesk, *Phil. Woch.* 1931, cols. 796-8.

Many authorities, says Polybius, distinguish three forms of constitution; we should ask them (3. 6) whether they consider these three *ὡς μόνας ἢ καὶ νῆ Δί' ὡς ἀρίστας τῶν πολιτειῶν*. In both respects they would be wrong; for clearly we must regard as *ἀρίστην μὲν* the constitution that is a combination of all three (3. 7). *καὶ μὴν οὐδ' ὡς μόνας ταύτας προσδεκτέον* (3. 9); for we have witnessed the several debased forms of these three, viz. tyranny, oligarchy, and ochlocracy (3. 9-4. 5). Therefore we should say that there are not three forms but six (4. 6). Plainly this argument, with its double criticism of the view which identifies only three constitutions, is all of a piece and not to be arbitrarily split up. Kornemann's view may therefore be discarded.¹ The *anacyclosis* must begin at 4. 7 or else early in chapter 3.

De Sanctis commences it at 3. 1, on the grounds that 3. 1-4 contains the idea of foretelling the future from the past, which is an essential characteristic of the philosophy of *anacyclosis*. We have already had reason to think, however, that Polybius maintained the belief that one could foretell the future of a state—a fundamental tenet for a historian with a utilitarian purpose²—in connexion with the mixed constitution, and that quite logically, since the latter was not everlasting.³ This view is confirmed by an analysis of the present passage. What Polybius says here is that in the case of those Greek states which have often suffered a rise to greatness and then a change to the opposite, one may describe the past and foretell the future without difficulty, since it is easy to ascertain the known facts of their history and to foretell the future by inference from them (3. 1-2). But in the case of Rome (a) the facts are difficult to ascertain *διὰ τὴν ποικίλιαν τῆς πολιτείας*, (b) it is difficult to foretell the future *διὰ τὴν ἄγνοιαν τῶν προγεγονότων περὶ αὐτοὺς ἰδιωμάτων καὶ κοινῇ καὶ κατ' ἰδίαν*. Hence the need for particular attention.

This passage contains a double contrast, partly expressed, partly implied. The ups and downs of the Greek states are opposed to the relative stability of the Roman constitution; and the ease of securing knowledge about the past of the Greeks is contrasted with our ignorance of the 'peculiar features of public and private life at Rome in the past'; hence the difficulty in foretelling the future in the case of Rome. The stability of the Roman constitution is not specifically mentioned; but it is implied in *τὴν ποικίλιαν τῆς πολιτείας*, which is a reference to the mixed constitution by which stability is secured.

Once this double contrast is observed, the purpose of the passage is clear. It is in fact a programme in which Polybius announces his intention of describing (a) the *ποικίλια* of the Roman constitution (fulfilled in chs. 11-18), and (b) the past institutions of Rome (fulfilled in the *archaeologia* of which fragments only survive in 11 a). The contrast with the Greek states is a convenient form of introduction for Polybius' Greek readers. And the reference to foretelling the future is merely a reassertion of the general principle behind the *Histories*; it does not imply the theory of *anacyclosis*, which is not in fact provided for in the programme as here laid down. Chapter 3. 1-4 is thus a further confirmation that the *anacyclosis* section is a later insertion.⁴

From this it follows that 3. 1-4. 6 and 10 are part of the original plan; and in fact

¹ It also follows that Kornemann's termination of the *anacyclosis* section at 10. 6 (*ἀ προῖδόμενος*) must also be rejected, since it rests on a hypothetical continuation of the reference to Lycurgus in 3. 8.

² Cf. xii. 25 b. 3: *ἐκ γὰρ τῶν ὁμοίων ἐπὶ τοῖς οἰκείους μεταφερομένων καιρῶν ἀφορμαὶ γίνονται καὶ προλήψεις εἰς τὸ προῖδέσθαι τὸ μέλλον*.

³ See above, p. 75 f.

⁴ I agree with Kornemann, *op. cit.* 173, that

the chapters on the army (19-42) look like 'ein gleichzeitig oder nicht allzu lang nachher ausgearbeiteter Nachtrag zum ersten Entwurf'. They do not figure in the programme as laid down in 3. 1-4 (which in any case only covers the first part of the book down to ch. 18); but they undoubtedly reflect Polybius' personal interest in military matters, and there is no reason for thinking them late.

these two
discussio
in the se
implicit
that wh
πραγμα
essentia
respecti
καὶ παρ
Thus, at
each oth
the mix
and Spa
parison
typical
as we sa

The
draft of
Svobod
For this
to other
as well
(47. 1:
pressed
of the f
(57. 4:
unequal

The
goes be
of the s
be asso
parison
aspects
any tin
commo
Kornem
the fut

¹ In
Lycurgu
ἀναγκα
in their
join the
(cf. Lac
reason t
further
10. 7.

² Lac
stratific
rejected

³ Korn
cit. 473.

⁴ Thi
A. Pass

these two passages fit very well together as an introduction to Polybius' detailed discussion of the mixed constitution. The first of these two has been outlined above; in the second Polybius briefly describes Lycurgus' attempt to avoid the deteriorations implicit in each of the simple constitutions by setting up a 'mixed state', similar to that which grew up gradually at Rome, οὐ μὴν διὰ λόγου, διὰ δὲ πολλῶν ἀγώνων καὶ πραγμάτων (10. 14).¹ For such a description of the mixed constitution it was, of course, essential that Polybius should describe not only the three main forms but also their respective παρεκβάσεις, the κακία which τῶν πολιτειῶν συγγενᾶται κατὰ φύσιν ἐκάσῃ καὶ παρέπεται (10. 4), and which the mixed constitution was designed to eliminate. Thus, after the 'programme' passage (3. 1-4), 3. 5-4. 6 and 10 reinforce and supplement each other, and serve as a preliminary sketch for the more elaborate description of the mixed constitution in 11-18; and at the same time the analogy between Rome and Sparta (the traditional example of the mixed constitution) foreshadows the comparison of constitutions in 43-58. This short preliminary broaching of a topic is typical of Polybius' didactic method; it occurs again in the *anacyclosis* section, where as we saw, 4. 7-4. 10 outlines the process later elaborated in 5. 4-9. 9.

The view that Polybius' comparison of constitutions (43-58) was part of the first draft of Book VI is that of Laqueur and De Sanctis.² Kornemann, however, follows Svoboda in linking it with the *anacyclosis* and regards it as part of the second draft.³ For this view he offers four reasons: (1) In these chapters the comparison is extended to other constitutions, the Athenian, Theban, Mantinean, Cretan, and Carthaginian as well as the Lycurgan. (2) The comparison goes deeper; the moral life of the people (47. 1: ἔθνη καὶ νόμοι) is now taken into account.⁴ (3) The theory of evolution is now pressed throughout, in contrast to the emphasis on the 'mixed state', characteristic of the first draft. (4) Polybius now formulates the possibility of 'foreseeing the future' (57. 4: προοιπεῖν ὑπὲρ τοῦ μέλλοντος), which depends on the *anacyclosis*. These points, unequal in weight though they are, require some consideration.

The second and fourth are briefly dealt with. It is of course true that Polybius goes beyond merely constitutional questions, and penetrates to the moral qualities of the states he discusses. But there is no reason why this broadening of scope should be associated with the *anacyclosis* rather than the mixed constitution. Once a comparison is instituted, it is a natural development to extend it to include general aspects of the peoples compared; and Polybius could have made this equally well at any time.⁵ Similarly, as we have already seen,⁶ the idea of foreseeing the future is common to both the *anacyclosis* and the mixed constitution. The passage to which Kornemann refers (57. 4) is, as it happens, closely connected with the conception of the future determination of Roman society, and is probably, as Cuntz saw, a later

¹ In ch. 10. 1-2 the words "ἐκεῖνος (i.e. Lycurgus) γὰρ ἕκαστα τῶν προειρημένων συννόησας ἀναγκαίως καὶ φυσικῶς ἐπιτελούμενα, κτλ." must in their present form be a link, introduced to join the *anacyclosis* section with what follows (cf. Laqueur, op. cit. 245). But there is no reason to follow Laqueur and Cuntz in seeing further insertions or adaptations in 10. 4-5 and 10. 7.

² Laqueur, op. cit. 243 ff. (the elaborate stratification and the chronology are to be rejected); De Sanctis, *Storia*, iii. 1. 206 f.

³ Kornemann, op. cit. 173 ff.; Svoboda, op. cit. 473.

⁴ This argument was given prominence by A. Passerini, *Stud. ital. fil. class.* N.S. xi, 1934,

43, who, like Kornemann, assumed that such passages as ch. 57 contain a genuine prophecy of the disruption of Roman society. Subsequently, in a review of Bilz, op. cit., in *Gnomon*, xiii, 1937, 238, Passerini declared himself converted to the complete 'unitarian' position; the attempt to detect contradictions and different strata in Polybius vi was now rejected as 'una critica ora, sembra, superata'.

⁵ Cf. i. 13. 12: at the time of the first Punic War both Rome and Carthage were uncorrupted in morals. Clearly Polybius was interested in this aspect from the start.

⁶ See above pp. 75-6 and 80, criticizing De Sanctis' view that 3. 1-4 is to be associated with the *anacyclosis* section.

insertion. But this has nothing at all to do with the use of the phrase *προειπεῖν ὑπὲρ τοῦ μέλλοντος*; and the futility of trying to use this as a criterion of stratification or chronology is evident from the fact that 3. 1-4, which contains exactly the same phrase (3. 2), is (rightly) attributed by Kornemann to the first draft.¹

The extension of the comparison geographically from Lycurgan Sparta to Athens, Thebes, Mantinea, Crete, Carthage, and even Plato's *Republic* is also alleged by Kornemann to indicate the late composition of the comparative chapters. However, Athens and Thebes are only mentioned to be ruled out of court, nominally to help at arriving at a clear conception of what was being compared, actually to give the Achaean statesman a chance to castigate two states for which he shows a marked dislike.² Mantinea is not mentioned again after the preliminary reference in 43. 1;³ and Crete is only introduced in order that its inferiority to Lycurgan Sparta may be stressed. Both in the case of Crete and in that of Plato's *Republic*, which is also dismissed as irrelevant to the discussion (47. 7-10), the tone of polemic against previous writers is unmistakable.⁴ Eventually the only new state actually brought into comparison with Rome proves to be Carthage. And since the discussion of the Roman constitution was deliberately introduced at a point in the *Histories* which links it closely with Rome's success against Hannibal, viz. after the account of the battle of Cannae at the end of Book III,⁵ it is difficult to imagine that Polybius did not plan this comparison in his first draft, as an essential feature of any constitutional discussion at this juncture.⁶

In this connexion a strong argument against Kornemann exists in chapter 51, which undoubtedly falls into the context of passages which apply the conception of a natural rise, acme, and decline to all states. Various features serve to divide this chapter from 52, which completes the comparison of Rome and Carthage.⁷ The comparison is specifically applied to the time of the Hannibalic War, not cast in general terms, as in the next chapter; and, what is more important, Carthage is represented as having been at that time already on the decline, because the *δῆμος* had acquired the chief voice in deliberations, whereas Rome was still at her prime, since *ἀκμήν εἶχεν ἢ σύγκλητος*. While it would be an exaggeration to say that this chapter falls completely into line with the theory of the *anacyclosis*, its ideas are decidedly not those of the mixed constitution, however much one stresses the evolutionary background of this theory; for clearly it is a contradiction of the 'mixed constitution' to attribute the prime of the Roman constitution to a time when the aristocratical element was predominant.⁸ This chapter 51 will be discussed again below; let it

¹ Op. cit. 172; 178. Kornemann believes the insertion of the second draft to have begun at 3. 9.

² Examples of Polybius' well-known prejudice against Athens and Thebes (or Boeotia) are: v. 106. 6-8; xviii. 14. 10; xxx. 20. 1-7 (Athens); iv. 31. 5; xx. 5. 1 f.; xxii. 4 (Boeotia).

³ Mantinea is not classed with Athens and Thebes. But it can be assumed that Polybius intended to treat it severely. His attitude towards the town may be judged from ii. 48, a passage which Kornemann mentions, though it militates against his view (op. cit. 174, n. 21) that 'Polybios nahm an dieser Stadt . . . besonderen Anteil'.

⁴ Cf. 45. 1, with its references to Ephorus, Xenophon, Callisthenes, and Plato (Crete); 47. 7: *ἐπειδὴ καὶ ταύτην τινὲς τῶν φιλοσόφων ἐξημοῦσιν* (Plato's *Republic*).

⁵ Cf. iii. 2. 6; 118. 9 f.; v. 111. 10. Books IV and V are devoted to the contemporary events in Greece and Syria.

⁶ It is noteworthy that Cato had discussed the Carthaginian constitution as an example of the *μικτή*: Serv. ad *Aen.* iv. 682.

⁷ These features do *not*, however, include the past tenses of 51, which De Sanctis (*Storia*, iii. 1. 206) regards as a proof that ch. 51 was composed after 146. As I have explained, I think this exceedingly likely. But the past tenses have nothing to do with whether Carthage still existed; they merely indicate that Polybius was dealing with a definite time in the past. See further below, p. 84, n. 1.

⁸ Bilz, op. cit. 10 f., is aware of this difficulty; but his solution of it is inadequate. He argues: (1) vi. 10. 12 reveals the same view of the growth of the Roman constitution as the work of many

suffice h
mitted h
is oblig
to date
in a dile
hypothe

Final
tive cha
Athens
to the s
to the g
of the l
fact tha
through
stitution
constitu
short-liv
normal
mating
trary, th
Polybiu
which s
sages w
form; 5
with the

To s
version
Book V
a comb
of each
a consid
in which
the cons
account
the cons

men, not
as Cato's
it is typi
is that t
not that
φύσις and
only a
actually
Bilz, afte
cludes th
of compr
the schen
theory.
why Pol
constitut
¹ It n
necessari
anacyclos

suffice here to stress that its ideas suggest a late origin. Kornemann, having committed himself to the view that the comparative chapters belong to the second draft, is obliged, by reason of chapters 52 and 56, which speak of Carthage as still in existence, to date this second draft to the period *before* 146. But if 51 is later than 52, one is then in a dilemma from which the only escape is Laqueur's desperate and unacceptable hypothesis of a series of successively modified editions.

Finally, it is alleged that the evolutionary idea is stressed throughout the comparative chapters. Admittedly growth and decline are mentioned in connexion with Athens and Thebes (43-4), and for this reason De Sanctis too attributes these chapters to the second draft. It is, however, a complete fallacy to assume that *any* reference to the growth and decline of *any* state stamps the passage in which it occurs as part of the later draft, and associates it with the theory of *anacyclosis*. Apart from the fact that the mixed constitution had its growth and ultimate decline, Polybius insists throughout that swift corruption was an inseparable feature of all the simple constitutional forms. And it is not suggested that Athens and Thebes were ever stable constitutions. On the contrary, Polybius stresses (43. 5-44. 2) that both owed their short-lived success not to their constitution but to a few brilliant individuals; the normal and usual condition of these two states is described (44. 9) in terms approximating to those applicable to ochlocracy.¹ The Lycurgan constitution, on the contrary, though earlier traditions may have seen it as part of a defined process,² is to Polybius a divine dispensation—*θεωτέραν τὴν ἐπίνοιαν ἢ κατ' ἀνθρώπων*—a phrase which suggests the reverse of evolutionary development.³ In short, once those passages which we have reason to regard as part of the second draft (51 in its present form; 57) are subtracted, there is nothing in 43-57 which is not entirely consistent with the theory of the mixed constitution.

To sum up: Polybius' sixth book appears to contain two strands. The earlier version⁴ (including 2-4. 6; 10; 11-18; 19-42 (probably); 43-50; 52-6 of the present Book VI) was a study of the Roman constitution as the best example of the *μικτή*, a combination of kingship, aristocracy, and democracy, which avoids the tendency of each of the simple forms to deteriorate into its peculiar corruption, and so achieves a considerable degree of stability and relative permanence. After a short introduction in which the nature of the *μικτή* is briefly outlined, and a comparison drawn between the constitutions of Rome and Lycurgan Sparta, Polybius proceeds to give first an account of the early Roman institutions and history, and after it a full analysis of the constitution. Finally, after a discussion of the Roman army, which was an equally

men, not one (like the Spartan), that appears as Cato's opinion in Cic. *De rep.* ii. 1. 2, i.e. that it is typically aristocratic—to which the answer is that the contrast which Polybius stresses is not that between one and many, but between *φύσις* and *λόγος*. (2) The mixed constitution has only a 'verfassungsrechtlich' triple form; actually the Senate is predominant, cf. vi. 13. 9. Bilz, after the manner of La-Roche, then concludes that Polybius, seeing a successful form of compromise at Rome, forced it violently into the scheme of the 'mixed constitution' of Greek theory. This is really no explanation at all of why Polybius in one place speaks of a mixed constitution and in another of an aristocracy!

¹ It need hardly be said that this does not necessarily link these chapters to the theory of *anacyclosis*; ochlocracy is the specific corruption

of democracy, which is avoided by the setting up of a mixed constitution.

² Cf. V. Ehrenberg, reviewing Taeger, op. cit., in *Hist. Zeit.* cxxx (3. Folge, 34), 1924, 479, quoting various fourth- and third-century authorities; following Taeger, Ehrenberg here identifies aristocracy with the mixed constitution.

³ Even if one agrees to give it only a conventional meaning; cf. Ehrenberg, *Alexander and the Greeks* (1938), 73, n. 1.

⁴ This earlier version clearly links up with Polybius' first plan for a history going down to 167; see R. Thommen, *Hermes*, xx, 1885, 205 f., who compares vi. 2. 3 (with its reference to the whole world falling under Roman domination in less than 53 years) with the similar statement in i. 1. 5. Cf. above, p. 76, n. 2.

important factor in Roman success, he appends a comparison of the Roman, Spartan, and Carthaginian constitutions: of these the Spartan is introduced as the classical example of the *μικτὴ πολιτεία*, the Carthaginian because it is in connexion with the aftermath of Cannae that the Roman constitution is discussed at all. Later Polybius added a second strand to his discussion (4. 7-9. 14; addition or substitution of 51. 4-8;¹ 57; perhaps, but not necessarily, 58; and a few insertions here and there)² when the deterioration of the Roman constitution, always a theoretical possibility, had begun to loom prominently before his eyes. These later insertions are, as we saw above when discussing Zancan's theory,³ not all consistent with each other. Not only is there a contradiction between the earlier stratum which, while logically admitting the evolution of the Roman constitution, in fact laid all its emphasis on its stability, and the later passages which are permeated with the idea of change; but in these late passages there is a contradiction between that which outlines the schematic *anacyclosis* and those which speak of a law of growth, acme, and decline—a contradiction partially concealed under Polybius' equivocal use of the concept of 'nature'.⁴ It is these latter passages which seem to reveal the results of Polybius' own observation and so to provide an indication of why he was led to modify his philosophy of the Roman constitution.

IV

The possibility that Polybius derived his idea of the mixed constitution from Dicaearchus of Messana⁵ was considered by Schmekel and Susemihl, but rejected by the former because Dicaearchus believed in an early blessed condition of mankind.⁶ So long as Book VI was treated as a whole, there were indeed serious obstacles to accepting Dicaearchus as Polybius' source. But once Cuntz had propounded the theory of two drafts, it became clear that the earlier layer, with its belief in the relatively stable mixed constitution as an explanation of Roman success, was an inheri-

¹ As we saw, 51 differs from 52 in applying the constitutional comparison specifically to the time of the Hannibalic War (whereas the other features of comparison in 52 are mentioned in general terms). This difference may well go back to the first draft (see above, p. 75, n. 4); but the *details* of the comparison in 50 definitely brand it as a later insertion. Hence it is possible that §§ 4-8 (Laqueur would begin at *χεῖρον* in § 3) represent a later substitution for a version which corresponded more closely to the presumptions of the theory of the mixed constitution.

² Some scholars, particularly Cuntz, Laqueur, and De Sanctis, have suggested several insertions in chs. 10-12, viz. 10. 1 (reference to the *anacyclosis*); 11. 1 (Roman constitution at its height at the time of the Hannibalic War); 11. 11-13 (past tenses and transition to presents in 11. 13); 12. 10 (vague reference to future changes). With the exception of the first reference (10. 1: discussed above, p. 81, n. 1), all these are explicable as part of the first draft, on the assumption (a) that the mixed constitution was not everlasting, (b) that Polybius was *specifically* concerned with the period in reference to which he inserted his discussion at this point (viz. the years after Cannae), but tended for convenience to express much of his discussion of the Roman constitu-

tion, as later much of his comparison between the Roman and Carthaginian constitutions, in *general* terms, using present tenses. It was only afterwards, when he was impressed by the imminence of Roman decline, that this gap between the Hannibalic War and his own time assumed a real significance. It has already been suggested that in 12. 9 the words *καὶ βασιλικόν* (like the addition *καὶ τυραννικόν* in 3. 9: see above, p. 79, n. 2) were inserted later, probably in an attempt to adjust the earlier expression to fit the more precise terminology of the *anacyclosis* passage (see above, p. 77, n. 5).

³ See above, pp. 74 f.

⁴ These passages are 9. 12-14; 51. 4-8; 57. In chs. 43-4 Polybius had already applied the conception of growth, acme, and decline in discussing the unstable constitutions of Athens and Thebes (see above, p. 83).

⁵ It is of course older than Dicaearchus; see above, p. 75, n. 5.

⁶ A. Schmekel, *Die Philosophie der mittleren Stoa* (1892), 64-5; Susemihl, *Gesch. der gr. Litt. in der Alexandrinerzeit*, ii (1892), 99, n. 75. The suggestion also appears in Newman, *Politics of Arist.* ii (1887), p. xiv; it was first made by Osann, *Beitr. zur gr. u. röm. Literaturgesch.* (1839), 23 ff.

tance from
εἶδος πολ
clearly de
Polybius
attributed
association
shadowed
that in di
confounde
acquainte
admit its
prepared
Tarentum
conception
(ζηρεῖ δεσ
at the out
he could h

Howe
Panaetius
and when
by Unger
Roman co
Meyer po
τοῦ δήμου
a century

¹ Photiu
recent disc
Philol. lxx
Wien. Sitz
ticularly 6
Wilamowit
common fo
(Hellen. D
in which t
is most p
Cicero, ad
(extract q
'Dikaiarch

² Ancien
³ Op. cit
influence o
op. cit. 84
xxvii, 1918
op. cit. 17
Das Führe
57-8; and
berg point
1924, 480).

⁴ See St
⁵ Ibid.
⁶ For d
see, beside
(above, p.
zu Ciceros
Exkursus

tance from Dicaearchus' *Τριπολιτικός*, with its discussion of what Photius termed the *εἶδος πολιτείας Δικαιαρχικόν*.¹ This theory was suggested by Bury in 1909,² but first clearly developed by Laqueur, who also claimed to see some influence from Cato on Polybius' first draft.³ The later conception of the *anacyclosis* both Bury and Laqueur attributed to Panaetius of Rhodes, the representative of the Middle Stoa, whose association with the Scipionic circle is well known,⁴ and this division, already foreshadowed by Susemihl,⁵ has found general acceptance.⁶ It is, however, worth noting that in discussions of the *anacyclosis* two quite distinct questions have tended to be confounded; for it has been assumed that to ask 'When did Polybius first become acquainted with the theory of *anacyclosis*?' is the same as asking 'When did he first admit its application to the Roman constitution?' I stress this, because unless we are prepared to assume quite arbitrarily that viii. 24. 1 is a late insertion, this passage on Tarentum suggests that at a fairly early date Polybius was acquainted with the conception of a natural evolution of democracy (*ἐλευθερία* cf. vi. 57. 9) into despotism (*ζητεῖ δεσπότην*). This is something very near to the *anacyclosis*,⁷ and we may note at the outset that it suggests that Polybius was acquainted with the theory long before he could have learnt it from Panaetius.

However, to distinguish two layers and assign these to Dicaearchus and either Panaetius or his predecessors is of little use in itself. What we have to decide is why and when Polybius came to modify his earlier view. A popular explanation, suggested by Unger and Ed. Meyer,⁸ was that Polybius was convinced of the coming fall of the Roman constitution after witnessing the events of Tiberius Gracchus' tribunate; and Meyer pointed out a reference to Flaminius' land-law of 232 as *ἀρχηγὸν ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον τοῦ δήμου διαστροφῆς* (ii. 21. 8)—a judgement only intelligible in the light of events of a century later. Meyer's view was adopted by Cuntz and Bury, and by De Sanctis,⁹

¹ Photius, *cod.* 37, p. 8 a, 2 f. For the most recent discussion of Dicaearchus see F. Solmsen, *Philol.* lxxxviii, 1933, 238 ff., and F. Egermann, *Wien. Sitz.-ber.* ccxiv. 3 (1932), 55 ff., and particularly 61, n. 1. Egermann rightly rejects Wilamowitz's explanation of *Δικαιαρχικόν* as a common formation, meaning *ubi regnat iustitia* (*Hellen. Dichtung*, i. 64, n. 1). The *Τριπολιτικός*, in which the theory of the mixed constitution is most probably developed, is mentioned by Cicero, *ad Att.* xii. 32 and by Athen. iv. 141 a (extract quoted). See Martini, P.-W., s. v. 'Dikaiarchos', cols. 550-2.

² *Ancient Greek Historians*, 204 ff.

³ Op. cit. 248 ff.; cf. *Hermes*, lv, 1930, 165. The influence of Cato is also assumed by Schmekel, op. cit. 84; Ciaceri, *Rend. Linc.* (Sc. Mor.), S.V. xxvii, 1918, 236-49, 266-78; 303-15; Kornemann, op. cit. 171, n. 11; Bilz, op. cit. 10; E. Sarrazin, *Das Führerideal des Polybios* (Diss. Breslau, 1934), 57-8; and see above, p. 82, n. 6. But as Ehrenberg points out (*Hist. Zeit.* cxxx (3. Folge), 34), 1924, 480), it is not susceptible of proof.

⁴ See Susemihl, op. cit. ii. 63-80.

⁵ *Ibid.* 73; 74, n. 56; 99, n. 75.

⁶ For discussion of Panaetius and Polybius see, besides the works of Schmekel and Susemihl (above, p. 84, n. 6), R. Hirzel, *Untersuchungen zu Ciceros philosophischen Schriften*, ii (1892), Exkursus 7, 841 ff.; and R. von Scala, *Die*

Studien des Polybios, i (1890), 223 ff. (cf. Kornemann, op. cit. 179-80). Dicaearchus receives attention in the recent discussion on the sources of Cicero's *De re publica*; see the bibliography by E. Burck in R. Heinze's *Vom Geiste des Römerturns* (1938), pp. 291-2, and add W. Jaeger, *Berlin. Sitz.-ber.* 1928, 420-1: 'Über Ursprung u. Kreislauf des philosophischen Lebensideals' (Dr. Treves informs me that an enlarged edition of this essay appeared in Italian as an appendix to the Italian translation of Jaeger's *Aristotle* (1935); on Dicaearchus see p. 599 f.; 616-17); R. Philippson, *Phil. Woch.*, 1930, cols. 1171-84 (reviewing N. Wilsing, *Aufbau u. Quellen von Ciceros Schrift 'De re publica'* (Diss. Leipzig, 1929)); P.-W., s.v. 'M. Tullius Cicero' (1939), col. 1116; W. Schur, *Klio*, xxix, 1936, 64-5. In his *Reden u. Vorträge*, ii⁴ (1926), 199, Wilamowitz denies any influence of Panaetius on Polybius; cf. *Glaube der Hellenen*, ii. 394, 396.

⁷ Cf. W. Hoffmann, *Hermes*, lxxi, 1936, 18.

⁸ Unger, *Philol.* xli, 1882, 617, n. 15; Ed. Meyer, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Gracchen* (1894), 8 (= *Kleine Schriften*, i² (1924), 374).

⁹ Cuntz, op. cit. 41; Bury, op. cit. 208; De Sanctis, *Storia*, iii. 1. 206; cf. too Laqueur, *Hermes*, lxxv, 1930, 165; W. Schur, *Sallust als Historiker* (1934), 62 f. It appears most recently in G. Boccadoro, *La civiltà cattolica*, i. 1938,

who rightly neglected Svoboda's objections,¹ and insisted that the passages in which Polybius foresees the rise of popular elements at Rome may well be a *vaticinium ex eventu*. Recently, however, Kornemann has attempted to explain Polybius' change of view as purely philosophical in origin, and connected with the influence of Panaetius operating (even before 146) in the salons of the Scipionic circle.²

Now quite apart from any argument to be drawn from viii. 24. 1,³ it cannot be too strongly emphasized that Polybius was first and foremost a man of action, an Achaean politician, statesman, and general; that his *Histories* dealt with political action and were designed to assist future politicians; and that they everywhere reflect these origins and this purpose.⁴ Polybius was not a philosopher. Not only was he incapable of fabricating a system so complicated as the *anacyclosis*—this is generally admitted—but he is unlikely to have been moved to apply such a system to the Roman constitution on purely philosophical grounds. On the face of it, then, Kornemann's theory bears the stamp of improbability, because it is inconsistent with what we know of the historian's character.⁵ If gradually Polybius felt constrained to lay more and more emphasis on the mortality of the Roman constitution, and less upon its relative stability, it was because events forced this view upon him, and because in fact he personally believed that he saw signs of imminent decay. This is clear from a consideration of one of those passages which, we have seen, develop the conception of growth, acme, and decline, which was always implicit, but scarcely more, in the theory of the mixed constitution, and so serve to bridge the gap which separates the latter theory from that of the *anacyclosis*.

In chapter 57 Polybius rounds off his comparison of the Roman with the Spartan and Carthaginian constitutions with a prophecy of the decline of the former into ochlocracy or mob-rule. The process by which this is to come about is carefully analysed and bears a close resemblance to the last stage but one in the *anacyclosis* as outlined in 9. 4-9; but there are two differences. First, Polybius betrays the sympathies of the Achaean oligarch when he characterizes this last stage as τῶν μὲν ὀνομάτων τὸ κάλλιστον . . ., τὴν ἐλευθερίαν καὶ δημοκρατίαν, τῶν δὲ πραγμάτων τὸ χείριστον, τὴν ὀχλοκρατίαν (57. 9).⁶ In this formulation—quite distinct from that of the *anacyclosis* section, where democracy and ochlocracy are two successive stages in an eternal progression—we hear the authentic voice of prejudice, of the Achaean leader and friend of Scipio; here is the freshness of experience personally apprehended and not yet accommodated to a dry, philosophical scheme. Secondly, the decline into democracy-ochlocracy takes its start not from something abstract—the internal movement of society κατὰ φύσιν—but from the extravagance and rivalry of one citizen against another which inevitably follows upon a period of long-established prosperity, based on supremacy and uncontested sovereignty—ὑπεροχὴν καὶ δυναστείαν ἀδμήριτον—in short, as one of the fruits of empire.⁷

This supremacy and uncontested sovereignty was of course no figment of political theory; it was a fact of history dating from the destruction of Carthage and Corinth in 146. Polybius witnessed the fall of Carthage in Scipio's company;⁸ his confused

145-58: 'L'idea di Roma in Polibio', an essay from which Dr. Treves kindly sent me a résumé of the relevant passages.

¹ Svoboda, op. cit. 472-3, dates the composition of ch. 51 before 146, on the grounds that it is part of the comparison of constitutions, which presupposes the existence of Carthage!

² Op. cit. 180 ff.

³ See above, p. 85.

⁴ Cf. ix. 2. 5; and see Bury, op. cit. 199 f.

⁵ On this point I am in complete agreement

with Bilz, op. cit. 9.

⁶ Similarly in 51. 6 the acme at Rome is identified with aristocracy.

⁷ It is noteworthy that Polybius' observation of this process has influenced his schematic account also; the passage from democracy to ochlocracy within the *anacyclosis* is more fully described than any of the other changes (9. 4-9). This point is recognized by Laqueur, *Hermes*, lxxv, 1930, 166.

⁸ Polyb. xxxviii. 22. 3 (= App. Pun. 132).

feelings a
Greeks re
evolution
and excep
formerly
her enem
of μοναρχ
εοικὸς δα
process, l
(9. 3); an
deriving
περιποιήσ
ἀγούσιν ἐ

Accor
Carthage
incidents
to repeat
finally led
of Tiberi
still indec
but rathe
of membe

¹ This cl
the essay
1931, 225-5
juridiques
points out
the pro-Ro
Polybius re
Polybius h
entirely at
ro) is not
than that
perception
Bilz, op. ci
Ist. Veneto
della terza
work was
Abyssinian
Punic War
modating a
pursue a po
'contro la r

³ Cf. E. I.
cols. 689-90.

⁴ It is no
xxxviii. 1. 5
the Achae
meiosis tha
γε πρὸς τοὺ
Much of thi
essay of M.
'Nasicas W
Karthagos',
question of
by Zancan,

feelings about the second catastrophe are reflected in his uneasy analysis of how the Greeks reacted to it (xxxvi. 9).¹ That he regarded the year 146 as decisive in the evolution of Rome is here made abundantly clear. Standing aside himself—explicitly and exceptionally²—he puts forward as the view of certain of the Greeks that, whereas formerly Rome had been satisfied with an admission of defeat, she now exterminated her enemies root and branch; while others condemned the Roman action as smacking of μοναρχικῆς πραγματοποιίας . . . μᾶλλον ἢ πολιτικῆς καὶ Ῥωμαϊκῆς αἰρέσεως καὶ προσεοικὸς ἀσεβήματι καὶ παρασπονδήματι. As Gelzer observes, Polybius regretted the process, but admitted its inseparability from the conquest of ἀρχή (9. 4) and δυναστεία (9. 3); and in a formula now preserved only in Diodorus (xxxii. 2 and 4), but certainly deriving from Polybius,³ the whole matter is succinctly stated: ὅτι οἱ τὰς ἡγεμονίας περιποιήσασθαι βουλόμενοι κτῶνται μὲν αὐτὰς ἀνδρεία καὶ συνέσει, πρὸς αὐξήσῃ δὲ μεγάλῃν ἄγρουσιν ἐπιεικεία καὶ φιλανθρωπία, ἀσφαλίζεται δὲ φόβῳ καὶ καταπλήξει.⁴

According to Plutarch, *Cato*, 27. 3 f., Nasica's opposition to the destruction of Carthage sprang from a fear of the people;⁵ and Gelzer⁶ has underlined some of the incidents of the years following 151 which may have alarmed him. It is unnecessary to repeat his arguments here. The point I would make is that whether Polybius was finally led to assume the imminence of a decline of the Roman constitution as a result of Tiberius Gracchus' tribunate or not—and I regard the evidence on this point as still indecisive⁷—those events are not to be regarded as isolated or entirely novel, but rather as part of a movement which was already thrusting itself on the notice of members of the Scipionic circle by about 150 B.C.;⁸ and that from the time of the

¹ This chapter receives detailed attention in the essay of Ch. Saumagne, *Rev. Hist.* clxvii, 1931, 225-53; clxviii, 1931, 1-42: 'Les prétextes juridiques de la III^e guerre punique'. Saumagne points out the juridical form taken both by the pro-Roman and anti-Roman propaganda, as Polybius reveals it here; but his assertion that Polybius himself accepted this Roman case entirely at its face value (op. cit. clxviii, 1931, 10) is not convincing. Polybius saw deeper than that (cf. xxxvi. 2. 1-4); he had at least the perception of a Nasica Corculum. See also Bilz, op. cit. 30-1, and L. Zancan, *Atti del r. Ist. Veneto*, xcv. 2, 1935-6, 529-601: 'Le cause della terza guerra punica'. (Zancan—whose work was written at the time of the Italo-Abyssinian War—tries to show that the Third Punic War was due ultimately to the unaccommodating attitude of Carthage, and her attempt to pursue a policy disproportionate to her strength, 'contro la realtà'.)

² Cf. xxxvi. 1. 1-7.

³ Cf. E. Schwartz, P.-W., s.v. 'Diodoros (38)', cols. 689-90.

⁴ It is no contradiction of the above that in xxxviii. 1. 5, contrasting the Carthaginians with the Achaeans, Polybius asserts with stylistic meiosis that the former τόπον ἔσχον ἀπολογίας γε πρὸς τοὺς ἐπιγινόμενους περὶ σφῶν ἀπείλειον. Much of this paragraph depends on the excellent essay of M. Gelzer, *Philol.* lxxxvi, 1931, 261-99: 'Nasica's Widerspruch gegen die Zerstörung Karthagos', the relevance of which for the question of Polybius' political views is observed by Zancan, *Rend. Ist. Lombardo*, lxix, 1936, 520.

Gelzer's essay should be studied in conjunction with the very suggestive work of Saumagne, quoted above, n. 1.

⁵ Cf. App. *Pun.* 69; Diod. xxxiv. 33. 4-6; Oros. iv. 23. 9; Florus, i. 31. 5; Zon. ix. 30. 7. See further, Bilz, op. cit. 22 f. The analogy between this argument and the analysis of Polyb. vi. 57 has not escaped notice; cf. Gelzer, op. cit. 277; Bilz, op. cit. 25 (who seems, however, to contradict himself later, 31, when he identifies the standpoint of Polybius with that of Cato).

⁶ Op. cit. 285 ff. Also Saumagne's analysis of Nasica's arguments (*Rev. Hist.* clxviii, 1931, 30 ff.), which is based on Gsell's hypothesis (*Histoire ancienne de l'Afrique du Nord*, iii. 329, n. 6; cf. L. Zancan, *Atti del r. Ist. Veneto*, xcv. 2, 1935-6, 577, n. 42; 591, n. 54) that the arguments in Appian, *Pun.* 61 f., which nominally refer to 202, in fact reflect those used by Nasica at the time of the Third Punic War, is substantially in accordance with this interpretation.

⁷ Polybius' criticism of Flaminius' land bill in ii. 21. 8 (see above, p. 85) is not decisive, since the significance and the implications of land-legislation must have been clear to the Scipionic circle at least as early as the successful attempt to dissuade C. Laelius from such legislation during his consulship in 140 B.C.; on Laelius' land-bill (Plut. *Tib. Gracch.* 8. 5) see Münzer, P.-W., s.v. 'C. Laelius (3)', col. 406; Bilz, op. cit. 47-8; J. Göhler, *Rom und Italien* (= Breslauer hist. Forsch., Heft 13, 1939), 99-100.

⁸ Cf. Bilz, op. cit. 13; G. Busolt-H. Swoboda, *Griech. Staatskunde*, i (1920), 99.

destruction of Carthage and Corinth, Polybius was being compelled by the pressure of events to change the emphasis in his view of the Roman constitution, until eventually he had reached a frame of mind in which he recognized in the Stoic *anacyclosis* a more adequate explanation of its development than in the mixed constitution of Dicaearchus.¹ Accordingly, at some date subsequent to 146 he drafted the new chapters, both those in which he expressed the convictions based on his new observations (51 and 57), and the schematic account of the *anacyclosis*, including the concluding paragraphs (9. 12-14) which act as a link between old and new; for, either because the mixed constitution had never been regarded as *absolutely* permanent and Polybius' conversion to the idea of change had been gradual, or because the book was not given a final revision, the earlier chapters were never excised, and the mixed constitution remained, with the stress now laid upon its role at the time of the Hannibalic War.

V

This essay has a twofold purpose. First, I have not tried to propound any novel or striking theory of the composition of Book VI of Polybius, but rather to re-examine and co-ordinate the arguments which various scholars have at divers times put forward; in particular, I have attempted to sort the wheat from the chaff in the two papers of Kornemann and Zancan, both of which possess positive merits but must, I suggest, be regarded as retrograde in their general conclusions. Secondly, I hope to have reinforced the view that the development in Polybius' *Staatstheorie* represents its author's reaction to the issues raised by the growth of the Roman Empire in the second century B.C.² Surveying the process from outside, as a foreigner, yet in close contact with the keen sensibilities of the Scipios and their circle, Polybius could not but be deeply moved by the growing antithesis between *ἐπιείκεια* and *δυναστεία*—an antithesis which was first explicit in the open opposition of a minority in the Senate to the 'nova et callida sapientia' of Q. Marcius Philippus in 172,³ but became clearer in the process which led to the annihilation of Carthage in 146—by the retribution which the empire manifestly held in store for the ruling oligarchy that consolidated it—a fate clearly foreseen by Scipio Aemilianus as he gazed upon the ruins of Carthage:

ἔσσεται ἡμῶν ὅταν ποτ' ὀλέσῃ "Ἰλιος ἱρὴ
καὶ Πριάμος καὶ λαὸς ἑυμμελίῳ Πριάμῳ

—and by the shadow of coming disaster thrown already over the internal history of Rome by the accumulation of foreign conquests.⁴ As he witnessed the opening stages of this sequence, which held implicit within it the decay of the Roman system which had beaten Hannibal, Polybius was first of all overwhelmed with the idea of imminent change and mortality; but sooner or later, as he sought to reduce these disturbing ideas to order, and so to the service of pragmatistical historiography, he was attracted to the Stoic doctrine of the *anacyclosis*, which he knew of before, but which perhaps now received additional emphasis through his contact with Panaetius. In a flash of illumination the *bourgeois* historian of Megalopolis began to recognize in the first signs of popular unrest, in the first symptomatic challenge from within to the rulers of an empire now unchallengeable from without, the herald of approaching ochlocracy.

¹ He must have been considerably helped by the ease with which the early history of Rome (the monarchy of Romulus, the kingship of Numa, the tyranny of Tarquin, and the aristocracy of the early republic) fit into the scheme of the *anacyclosis*; cf. Newman, *Politics of Aristotle*, ii, p. xiv.

² Cf. Polyb. iii. 2. 6: ὑποδείκνυται ὅτι μέγιστα

συνεβάλει αὐτοῖς ἡ τοῦ πολιτεύματος ἰδιότης . . . πρὸς τὸ κρατήσαντας τῷ πολέμῳ Καρχηδονίων ἔνοιαν σχεῖν τῆς τῶν ὅλων ἐπιβολῆς.

³ Cf. Saumagne, *Rev. Hist.* clxviii, 1931, 27; I have discussed the details of this embassy in *JRS.* xxxi, 1941, 82-93.

⁴ Polyb. xxxviii. 22. 2; see in particular Ed. Meyer, *Kleine Schriften*, i², 374.

In Scipio
son Sera
class to
it is the
at least
He will a

Thus
a time o
reflected
defining
Achaean
city and
tions in
if Rome
within th
born of
between
structure
combined

'His
Von Scal
social str
the incli
evoked a
in his ac
overthro

The o
faced wi
His stud
successiv
schemati
limitatio
sociology
already h
interest p
and post
as a stud
Book VI
philosoph
stimulus

THE U

¹ Op. cit.

² Cf. *Pol.
Republic*, v
in practic
into almos
self in a le

In Scipio Nasica Corculum's opposition to the imperialism of Cato and that of his own son Serapio to Tiberius Gracchus was typified the vain resistance of the old senatorial class to two stages—the *ὑβρις* and the *νέμεσις*—of a single, inevitable movement; and it is the consciousness of this inevitability that weighs heavily upon Polybius, tingeing at least the parts of his work which he wrote last with a sombre, pessimistic hue. He will attempt analysis, but he has no effective remedy to prescribe.

Thus in his sixth book the social and moral contradictions of the second century, a time of gestation before the painful and protracted birth pangs of a new order, are reflected in those inner inconsistencies which La-Roche sensed without clearly defining, certainly without observing how they developed spontaneously as the Achaean historian tried to adjust his outlook to the changing relations of imperial city and provinces, of governors and governed, of Rome and Greece. For these relations in turn had their repercussions upon the social struggle in both countries alike; if Rome was hastening towards a crisis that still lay in the future, the ruling classes within the Greek leagues and cities were already caught on the horns of a dilemma, born of the separation of society into rich and poor, and the consequent contrasts between Hellenic patriotism and class interests. But this contradiction in the very structure of second-century society lay beyond Polybius' scope; his whole upbringing combined to prevent his coming to grips with it.

'His schooling as an Arcadian landowner and the ethics of Stoicism', observes Von Scala,¹ 'conspired together to conceal from Polybius the deep significance of the social structure; together they bear the responsibility for the fact that he lacks even the inclination to portray the inner developments, that the violent fermentation evoked at Rome by the twin forces of plutocracy and pauperism finds no place at all in his account, and the profound economic confusion in Greece before her political overthrow only incidental mention.'

The condemnation is just. Both at Rome and in his native land Polybius was faced with a series of problems which he could not fully formulate, still less solve. His study of the Roman constitution in the sixth book, with its imperfect sutures, its successive and ultimately irreconcilable theories of the state, alike in their jejune and schematic nature, yet revealing at points a politician's eye, keen within its own limitations, is very much the measure of the man who wrote it. As a contribution to sociology it is practically worthless; its culminating thesis of the *anacyclosis* had already been refuted in essence by Aristotle,² and to the political scientist its main interest perhaps lies in its influence on Cicero's *De re publica*, and on such Renaissance and post-Renaissance theories as those of Machiavelli, Guicciardini, and Vico. But as a study of the details of the second-century constitution of Rome in practice, Book VI of Polybius, if doctrinaire, is still useful material for the historian; and for the philosopher, as an example of how ideas come to be modified in response to the stimulus of events, it holds a secure place among Greek political writings.

F. W. WALBANK.

THE UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL.

¹ Op. cit. i. 255.

² Cf. *Polit.* v. 12. 1316^a, 1 f. (criticizing Plato, *Republic*, viii, 546 B.C.). Aristotle points out that in practice any type of constitution can turn into almost any other. Moreover, Polybius himself in a less doctrinaire passage (ii. 44. 6) speaks

of tyrannies giving way to τῆς τῶν Ἀχαιῶν δημοκρατίας; and in ii. 41. 5 the Achaeans themselves, being dissatisfied with their kings, the sons of Ogyges, ἐπὶ τῷ μὴ νομίμως, ἀλλὰ δεσποτικῶς αὐτῶν ἄρχειν, μετέστησαν εἰς δημοκρατίαν τὴν πολυτέλειαν.

TACITEA

Annals, i. 31. 4: 'implere ceterorum rudes animos: uenisse tempus quo . . .'. *Implere* has been suspected and *impellere* has been suggested. Andresen says 'implere . . . womit, zeigen die folgenden Reden. Curt. x. 1. 28 credulas regis aures implebat'. The passage of Curtius continues not with an accusative and infinitive but with the words *dissimulans causam irae*. A better defence is to be seen in Livy, xlv. 31. 6.

36. 1: 'etenim nuntiabatur parari legatos, qui superiorem exercitum ad causam eandem traherent; destinatum excidio Vbiorum oppidum, imbutasque praeda manus in direptionem Galliarum erupturas'. Thomas Gordon in the eighteenth century, and the anonymous Bohn translator and Church and Brodribb in the nineteenth, appreciated the rhetoric and correctly understood *manus* to mean 'hands'. In the twentieth century G. G. Ramsay, Goelzer, and Mr. J. Jackson, like Bötticher and Beesly in the nineteenth, all suppose that *manus* means 'troops'. In the ninth chapter of the second of the longer declamations ascribed to Quintilian the writer urges the unlikelihood that a blind man will commit crime, and asks 'ad quod erumpant manus quae proxima quaeque tam diu quaerunt?'

42. 4 'infecta sanguine castra, flumina, meque precariam animam inter infensos trahere'. The last clause was rightly understood by Gordon and Murphy in the eighteenth century; but in the nineteenth the error was commonly made of supposing that *animam trahere* means 'prolong my life', and Housman was moved to remark in the *Journal of Philology*, xxv, 1897, p. 248 that the words mean 'draw my breath'. Mr. J. Jackson in 1931 does not believe it, and gives the rendering 'linger out a precarious life'. Perhaps he also misunderstands Livy, iii. 6. 8 and iv. 12. 11, and even Seneca, *ep.* ci. 14; but, if he contemplates *Octavia*, 243-4 'et lucem uidet | fruiturque uita noxiam atque animam trahit' or Plin. *N.H.* xi. 6 'nec uideo cur magis possint non trahere animam talia et uiuere quam spirare sine uisceribus', perhaps he will realize that Housman was right.

62. 1 'gratissimo munere in defunctos et praesentibus doloris socius'. Andresen says 'gratissimo in defunctos wie in uulgo grata' in i. 28. 3 and ii. 59. 1. In *defunctos* depends on *munere*: cf., for instance, Livy, iv. 59. 11, v. 3. 4, and Lucan, ix. 131-2.

iii. 57. 1 'nec tamen repertum nisi ut effigies principum, aras deum, templa et arcus aliaque solita censerent, nisi quod M. Silanus ex contumelia consulatus honorem principibus petiuit'. With the awkwardness of the repetition in *nisi ut* and *nisi quod* compare the repetition in *quominus* and *quo modo* in *Ann.* iv. 70. 3 'quaesitum meditatumque, ne quid impedire credatur, quominus noui magistratus, quo modo delubra et altaria, sic carcerem recludant'.

iv. 41. 1 'adsiduos in domum coetus arcendo'. Nipperdey originally said 'adsiduos in domum, "fortwährend in sein Haus strömend"', and Furneaux says of *in domum* 'Nipp. rightly takes this closely with "adsiduos", "streaming into his house"'. But when Furneaux wrote that, Nipperdey had altered his note to 'adsiduos in domum coetus, "fortwährend in sein Haus strömend": jedoch hängt in domum von coetus ab'. Cf. Livy, iv. 25. 9 'coetus indicere in domos tribunorum plebis'.

xi. 30. 1 'Calpurnia (id paelici nomen)'. R. Kunze in *Phil. Woch.*, 1927, 831 says that the manuscript has not *id* but *idem*, and he therefore conjectures *id enim*, which F. A. Marx, Bursian's *Jahresbericht*, ccxlvii, 1935, p. 50 calls an 'einleuchtende Verbesserung'. It would doubtless have been proposed long ago if the manuscript really had *idem*. In fact it plainly has *id*, and the passage is like xii. 51. 3 'Zenobiam (id mulieri nomen)' or *Hist.* ii. 4. 2 'Sostratus (sacerdotis id nomen erat)'. It is remarkable that the same false statement about the reading of the manuscript and

the same
1937.

xiv. 3
Cf. Livy,
Is *terga* p
that *tergo*
Andersson
praebere
place ph
or 'comm
'hat wohl
seinem E
that *tergo*
instances
bare' or

xv. 4
which I d
magistr
aduersus
satis pos
rectius s
stituit, n
sublati'.

Histori
and it is
16. 1 but

64. 2
Library m
Tacitus i
certare m

84. 3
iii. 65. 2 a
hier caed
xv. 82, 's
Sen. *De*

iii. 23
plural is
avoid the
Ann. xv.

the plura
Über den

Conin
something
or had be
years; bu
the *Anna*
after Virg

¹ Moore
see, for in
49. 3, 58. 1
iv. 72. 4;
are a trou

the same needless conjecture are made by Mr. J. Jackson in his edition published in 1937.

xiv. 37. 1 'uelut cuneo erupit. . . ceteri terga praebuer'. *Velut* has caused surprise. Cf. Livy, xxxv. 15. 2 (34. 2 just before recalls xxxv. 5. 6 'frequens ordinibus legio'). Is *terga praebere* unique, threadbare, or neither? Furneaux quotes Draeger's assertion that *terga praebere* for *terga dare* is ἀπαξ εἰρημένον. On the other hand, Mr. J. G. C. Anderson in 1922 on *Agricola*, 37. 3 says 'terga praestare: for the threadbare dare, praebere'; and Gudeman in 1928 says 'a new expression coined to avoid the commonplace phrase *terga dare*, praebere'. These descriptions of *terga praebere* as 'threadbare' or 'commonplace' appear to be based on Löfstedt, *Philol. Komm. zur Peregr. Aeth.*, p. 206 'hat wohl der grosse Künstler der gehobenen Sprache hier einen Ersatz für das auch nach seinem Empfinden allzu abgenutzte dare oder praebere wollen'. Draeger's statement that *terga praebere* is ἀπαξ εἰρημένον is refuted by Curt. iv. 14. 14. There may be other instances which I have forgotten; but I shall not believe that the phrase is 'threadbare' or 'commonplace' until the evidence is produced.

xv. 40. 1 'rursum grassatus ignis, patulis magis urbis locis'. For the sibilant, which I do not believe was intended as having a particular effect, cf. xiv. 52. 2 'exueret magistrum, satis amplis doctoribus instructus maioribus suis'; *Hist.* i. 84. 3 'nec illas aduersus senatum uoces ullus usquam exercitus audiat'; ii. 48. 2 'satis sibi nominis, satis posteris suis nobilitatis quaesitum'; iv. 46. 2 'ingressus castra Mucianus, quo rectius stipendia singulorum spectaret, suis cum insignibus armisque uictores constituit, modicis inter se spatiis discretos'; 63. 1 'Ciuilis et Classicus rebus secundis sublatis'.

Histories, i. 57. 2 'instinctu et impetu et auaritia'. The meaning has been disputed, and it is worth noticing how the first two nouns are coupled not only in *Annals*, xiv. 16. 1 but also in Plin. *ep.* i. 22. 10.

64. 2 'benigne excepti modestia certauere'. C. H. Moore in the Loeb Classical Library misunderstands Tacitus as meaning 'vied with one another in good behaviour'.¹ Tacitus is thinking of Livy, xxvii. 45. 10-11 'benigne omnia cumulata dare; modestia certare milites ne quid ultra usum necessarium sumerent'.

84. 3 'ad sanguinem et caedem'. W. Heraeus repeats his father's quotations of iii. 65. 2 and 83. 1 and Livy, xxiv. 25. 9; but in place of his father's 'so ist wohl auch hier caedes zu lesen' he says 'so ist vielleicht auch hier caedes zu lesen'. Cf. Ov. *M.* xv. 82, 'sine caede et sanguine', Petron. *Sat.* 82. 2 'caedem et sanguinem cogito', and Sen. *De Clem.* i. 25. 1 'citra sanguinem caedemque satietur'.

iii. 23. 2 'uincla ac libramenta tormentorum abscidissent'. Summers says 'the plural is strange, as the one engine . . . seems meant. Probably Tacitus wishes to avoid the similar endings -menta, -menti'. It is perhaps worth recalling that in *Ann.* xv. 63. 3 'senile corpus et parco uictu tenuatum lenta effugia sanguini praebebat' the plural avoids *tenuatum lentum effugium*. *Tormenta* is not included in E. Fischer's *Über den pluralischen Gebrauch der Substantiva bei Tacitus* (Jena, 1933).

Conington, we are told, 'used to say that he seldom opened Tacitus without finding something, which, as far as he could make out, had either not been explained at all, or had been explained amiss'.² A great deal has been done in the last seventy-five years; but much remains to do. One does not find in the existing commentaries on the *Annals* and the *Histories* the justification for Norden's speaking of Tacitus as, after Virgil, the greatest 'Künstler des Komponierens in der römischen Literatur';³

¹ Moore mistranslates several other passages: see, for instance, i. 4. 3, 17. 1, 19. 2, 36. 2, 49. 3, 58. 1, 89. 2; ii. 22. 2, 24. 3; iii. 20. 3, 80. 2; iv. 72. 4; v. 17. 1. Even names and numbers are a trouble to him at i. 67. 2; ii. 19. 2,

94. 2; iii. 7. 1, 35. 2, 73. 2; v. 14. 1.

² *Miscellaneous Writings*, p. xlv.

³ *Sitzungsb. d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Klasse*, 1934, p. 635.

and, as he observed, 'ein den vielseitigen wissenschaftlichen Anforderungen entsprechender Kommentar analytisch-exegetischer Art bleibt eine grosse Aufgabe für die Zukunft'.¹ It is deplorable that existing commentaries are so untrustworthy in matters of Latinity. For instance, Furneaux's valuable collection of matter on the *Annals* abounds in examples of the deficiency of his knowledge of Latin; even W. Heraeus is often in error; and Goelzer's commentary on the *Histories* is a work in which one reads such remarks as that 'habere, au lieu de ducere, avec un accusatif complément direct et un accusatif attribut est une construction étrangère à la prose classique', and that *atrocius*, an adverb which no Latin poet uses, is 'poétique pour véhémentius'. Of D'Agostino's commentary on *Histories*, iv, published in 1935, it is enough to say that no one should believe Gudeman's assertion that 'Text und Kommentar entsprechen . . . allen Ansprüchen, die man heutzutage an eine wissenschaftliche Ausgabe einer klassischen Schrift zu stellen berechtigt ist'. I hope to have elsewhere an opportunity of correcting some of the commentators' errors and of trying to stop or avert their repetition; and also of supplementing the commentaries with some certain or possible examples of literary reminiscence.

¹ Gercke-Norden, *Einl. in d. Altertumswissenschaft*, I³ (Leipzig, 1927), part 4, p. 115.

KING'S COLLEGE,
UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM,
NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE.

G. B. A. FLETCHER.

THE poet
narrative
have still
ἄρποιον
estates
(Ἐμινώδ)
royal floor
the spec
third He
Phyleus
lion, sus
Herakles
narrative
scape an
keying d
and cons
is, too, a
occupied
suppose,
nothing
Theseus
in the A
but both
bound on
the agree
an epic t

The p
author's
tainly no
(at least
œuvre. I
part of t
ing home
brooding
different

¹ See L.

² Notice
where the
said it w
Epimenide
Euphorion
moon was

³ A scra
Call. fr. 33
inquires th
herself. T
derives fro

There is

ΗΡΑΚΛΗΣ ΛΕΟΝΤΟΦΟΝΟΣ

(Theocr. *Id.* xxv)

THE poem to which Callierges attached the title 'Ηρακλῆς Λεοντοφόνος from the narrative which occupies its last hundred lines falls into three sections, of which two have still, and all no doubt had originally, separate titles. In the first ('Ηρακλῆς πρὸς ἀγροῖκον) Herakles is found in conversation with a rustic who describes to him the estates of Augeias and accompanies him in search of that king. In the second ('Ἐπιπώλησις) the hero, in attendance on Augeias and his son Phyleus, inspects the royal flocks and herds as they return at night to their folds and byres, and astonishes the spectators by the ease with which he repels the attack of a mighty bull. In the third Herakles and Phyleus are discovered on their way to the neighbouring town. Phyleus has heard from an Achaean stranger some account of the death of the Nemean lion, suspects that its slayer may have been his companion, and questions him. Herakles in reply tells the story. The poem exhibits the same conception of epic narrative as is seen in the authentic works of Theocritus.¹ There is the eye for landscape and the attention to setting conspicuous in *Id.* 13 and in Part 2 of *Id.* 22: the keying down of the miraculous and heroic conspicuous in *Id.* 24:² the easy command and constant memory of Homer which is in T. not confined to epic subjects. There is, too, at least one point of contact with Callimachus. Part 1, as has been said, is occupied by a conversation between a friendly rustic and Herakles, who, we must suppose, is seeking Augeias in order to clean out his cattle-byres. We know next to nothing of what passed in the *Hekale* of Callimachus between that heroine and Theseus on his way to deal with the bull of Marathon,³ and nothing of what passed in the *Actia* between Molorchos and Herakles on his way to kill the lion of Nemea;⁴ but both *Hekale* and *Molorchos* were treated as poor countryfolk who befriend a hero bound on a heroic mission, and, whatever may have been the divergences of handling, the agreement between the two poets in this far from obvious method of attacking an epic theme is noteworthy.⁵

The poem was dated by Wilamowitz,⁶ no doubt rightly, in the third century. Its author's conception of epic is that of a school seemingly never numerous and certainly not very long-lived,⁷ and there is no member of the school whose stature (at least as known to us) would not be enhanced by the addition of this work to his œuvre. If he were Theocritus we should welcome (to take only one example from each part of the poem) the pictures of the rustic and his dogs (68 ff.), of the cattle streaming homeward at evening, herd after herd, like banks of cloud (88 ff.), of terror brooding over the deserted countryside of Nemea (216 ff.)—pictures not widely different from some of T.'s,⁸ yet welcome in that they would extend his range and

¹ See Legrand, *Buc. gr.* ii. 69.

² Notice the agnostic answer to the question where the lion came from (197). Hesiod (*Th.* 327) said it was the offspring of the Chimaera: Epimenides (*fr.* 2) that it fell from the moon: Euphron (*fr.* 84 Powell) and others that the moon was its mother.

³ A scrap of this conversation is preserved in *Call. fr.* 33 Pfeiffer, from which it appears that she inquires the hero's errand and he asks her about herself. The brief description in *Plut. Thes.* 14 derives from Philochorus, not from Callimachus.

There is, by the way, no evidence at present

that the author of *Id.* 25 knew the *Hekale*, for what is proffered as such at Kapp, *Call. Hecal. fragmenta*, p. 4, is nugatory.

⁴ *Call. fr.* 6. *Fr.* 6 Pfeiffer (as Dr. Pfeiffer points out to me), is now seen from *p. Oxy.* 2169 to be from their conversation after the event.

⁵ Eumaios in the *Odyssey* no doubt supplies a distant analogy, and the author of *Id.* 25 has that poem often in mind.

⁶ *Buc. Gr.*, p. 165.

⁷ See K. Ziegler, *Das Hellenist. Epos*, II.

⁸ There is what might almost be a sketch for the second at 16. 90 ff.

repertory. There is also (if, as I think, we have a complete whole) the general plan of the poem,¹ which consists of three sections composed like books of the *Odyssey* in miniature yet leaving, between the books and before the first, blanks which the reader may supply if he will; three books, moreover, which presuppose as their theme the cleansing of Augeias' stables yet devote themselves exclusively to the setting of that story and make no mention of the Labour without which they would have no excuse for existing. It is a highly ingenious design, and, though we cannot be sure that it is original in this poet, at least he handles it very skilfully and successfully.² The poem, in short, would appreciably enlarge our knowledge of T., and among the dubious Idylls it stands alone in that respect.

The ascription of the poem to Theocritus rests on the heading Θεοκρίτου Ἡρακλῆς πρὸς ἀγροίκον. Δωρίδι. διηγηματικόν, which is found only in a few MSS.,³ may be no older than Triclinius, and is valueless. Of the three statements it contains, the second is false, for the poem is not in Doric; and the first is without authority, for the MSS. which thus ascribe this poem ascribe to T. also the Ἐπιτάφιος Βίωνος and other matter which cannot possibly be his. So far, therefore, as the MSS. are concerned the poem is no better than anonymous, nor is assistance to be found outside the MSS. It is not, like *Id.* 24 (which is actually anonymous in the MSS.), cited as T.'s by external authorities;⁴ nor has it, like *Id.* 26 (the authenticity of which, attested only by Eustathius and two early editions, has been doubted), vindicated its legitimacy by appearing in Theocritean papyri; and though there is seemingly a gap of about 500 lines in *p. Ant.* and nothing obvious to fill it,⁵ it would be venturesome indeed to assume that it once contained this poem. Plainly, therefore, those scholars, from Reiske⁶ and Brunck⁷ and Ruhnken⁸ to Wilamowitz and Legrand, who have removed *Id.* 25 from the canon have been fully justified in doing so.⁹

If I were minded to do the like I should at this point notify my opponents that the *onus probandi* lay on their shoulders, and I should sit back to await their reply with the comfortable assurance that internal evidence can seldom be decisive in such a matter. And in fact most of those who reject the poem have been content with a passive attitude, and I know of no elaborate attack upon it except that of G. Perrotta¹⁰ whose extremely lengthy argument is concerned with differences between it and T.'s authentic work. It contains, he says, more dialogue, and more elaborate similes, than T.'s epic Idylls, and is more closely modelled on Homer. It uses formulae of a Homeric type, borrows Homeric phrases with less modification than T., and is

¹ On which see Wilamowitz, *Textg.* 218. Wilamowitz noted that each part opens in a manner which can be paralleled from books of Homer. That of Part 1 most closely resembles *Od.* 9; that of Part 3, *Od.* 16 (to which Wilamowitz compared it). Many books both of the *Iliad* and of the *Odyssey* open like Part 2 with a time-note, though it is perhaps significant that there it is always dawn, here in the abbreviated book the afternoon. Note also that Part 1 ends much like *Il.* 19, and Part 3 sufficiently like *Il.* 24 to confirm the view that this is the original end of the poem.

² The break in *Id.* 24 after l. 102 bears some resemblance to the two in this poem.

³ Of the MSS. used by Wilamowitz it occurs, I think, only in C Tr. Ziegler cites it from Vat. 1379: Ahrens (I do not understand on what authority) from an *Apographum Aldi*. C omits Δωρίδι and places διηγηματικόν before the title.

⁴ It is not certain that the poem is cited even anonymously. Schmidt (*Hesych.* 5. 171) assigns seven glosses to this origin, of which ἀρρηγνός (83) and αὐτόφλοιον (208) are most plausibly so explained. Nor are imitations in other poets more numerous. It is possible that Quint. S. 8. 489 derives from 85 but it is not certain, and the two other borrowings collected by Ahrens (both from Nonnus) have very little plausibility. The account of Herakles and the Cretan bull at Quint. S. 6. 236 ff., though not mentioned by Ahrens, looks as though it owed something to 145 ff.

⁵ Hunt, *Two Theocritus Papyri*, p. 20.

⁶ *Animad.* p. 309.

⁷ *Analecta*, 1. 357.

⁸ *Hymn. in Cererem*, p. xi.

⁹ Cf. Hiller, *Beiträge*, 60, 66.

¹⁰ *Stud. II. di Fil. Class.*, n.s. iv. 217.

freer in
differs f
characte

Som
weight;
there ce
straining
however
another
and nec
on, for
these tw
compar
parts of
from its
Id. 13 is
Moreov
by way
element
extent a
in which
books o
himself
handlin
for her
nobody
convers
ties wou

Ther
The aut
critus.⁴
writing
from H
futile.⁵
and Am
tance w

¹ The
elaborate
xxv Theo
Ueber Th

² C.Q.
³ Amo
distingui
from tha
vomeis (x
the pure
9. 29 is
authent
But if P
at 7. 28 (t
setting) l
do not k
lary to d

freer in the use of Homeric metrical licences.¹ In the rustic scenes the vocabulary differs from that of the bucolic Idylls, the landscape is jejune and conventional, the character-drawing no better.

Some of these points are obviously matters of opinion; others are of little or no weight; in others again the differences seem to me overstressed. Still, differences there certainly are, and I shall add to them an impression that there is in *Id.* 25 less straining of language and less search for novelty than is usual in *T.* The question, however, is whether these differences establish a presumption that the poem is by another hand. If you are inquiring into the authenticity of *Id.* 8 or 9 it is legitimate and necessary to consider vocabulary, metrical licences, grammatical forms, and so on, for there are half a dozen genuine poems in exactly the same genre with which these two may be compared. With *Id.* 25, however, no authentic Idylls are precisely comparable. There are, it is true, epic narratives in *Id.* 13, in the second and third parts of *Id.* 22, and in *Id.* 24; but *Id.* 22 is a hymn, *Id.* 24, so far as one can judge from its mutilated end, was, if not a hymn, a poem composed for a competition, and *Id.* 13 is an epistle addressed to Nikias. None, therefore, is straight epic like *Id.* 25. Moreover, *Id.* 13 and *Id.* 22, Part 2, as I have argued elsewhere,² deliberately rehandle by way of example themes taken from Apollonius; and *Id.* 13 and 24 admit a Doric element to their dialect. Now, in an Alexandrian poet at any rate, style is to some extent a matter of deliberate choice, and variable to suit the dialect and poetic genre in which he elects at the moment to write; and if *T.* had composed three consecutive books of a miniature epic it would not have been surprising if he had chosen to model himself more closely on Homer than in his known works, and to vary appreciably the handling, vocabulary, and so on, which he considered suitable for bucolic poetry³ or for heroic narrative in another setting. There are several authentic poems which nobody would believe to be *T.*'s if they had no better credentials than *Id.* 25; and, conversely, if *Id.* 25 had, or were in future to acquire, decent credentials, its peculiarities would not, I think, form a valid ground for mistrusting them.

There is one other count in Perrotta's indictment which demands brief attention. The author of *Id.* 25, he says, imitates Apollonius, and therefore cannot be Theocritus.⁴ A good deal of the evidence he amasses proves only that two poets both writing epic in the third century tend to use the same vocabulary, some borrowed from Homer, some new to epic narrative or of recent coinage; and it is therefore futile.⁵ Moreover, Theocritus, when engaged in *Id.* 13 and 22 in rewriting the Hylas and Amykos episodes in the first and second books of Apollonius, betrays an acquaintance with those two books extending beyond the episodes with which he is concerned,⁶

¹ The relations of the poem to Homer are elaborately examined in E. Frohn's *De carmine xxv Theocriteo* (Halle, 1908). See also L. Genther, *Ueber Theokr. xxv u. Mosch. iv* (Luckau, 1891).

² *C.Q.* xxxii. 10; *C.R.* lvi. 11.

³ Among the words (mostly Homeric) which distinguish the pastoral vocabulary of *Id.* 25 from that of *T.*'s bucolic Idylls Perrotta counts *νομῆς* (109, 122). This noun does not occur in the purely bucolic Idylls and its occurrence at 9. 29 is therefore worth mention when the authenticity of that poem is under consideration. But if Perrotta had noticed that it occurs also at 7. 28 (that is in a personal poem with a pastoral setting) he would not have included it here. We do not know nearly enough about Greek vocabulary to determine whether it is accident or design

which admits *νέμεσθαι* and *νομεύειν* to *T.*'s bucolic poems, confines *νομῆς* to the peculiar *Id.* 7, and presents *νομός* only in the spurious *Id.* 27, *νομή* only in the probably spurious *Id.* 8.

⁴ p. 262. On resemblances to Apollonius see also Legrand, *Étude*, 19, C. Brinker, *de Theocriti vita carminibusque subditiis* (Rostock, 1884), 66. Brinker, however, thinks *T.* the author.

⁵ Some is worse than futile. E.g. (p. 257) *la parola ἀπορπεύς usata nell' Eracle, alla fine dei vv. 1 e 51, deriva certamente da ἀπορπεύς usato pure in fine di verso in Apollonio, 1. 1172. Do Aratus (1075, 1117) and Nicander (Th. 4), then, imitate Apollonius? Where in a dactylic hexameter does P. expect to find the word?*

⁶ *C.Q.* xxxii. 10, *C.R.* lvi. 11.

and if this poem were his there would be nothing surprising in further reminiscences. If plain contact between this poem and Books 3 and 4 were established it would be a fact worth noting, for I doubt whether such a contact between T.'s authentic poems and those books is demonstrable. But its implications would be problematical, and it certainly would not prove the poem not to be T.'s. I do not think, however, that Perrotta establishes the existence of such a contact, nor that, if it exists, the borrower is necessarily the author of *Id.* 25.¹

If we turn from the internal evidence in the poem which has been accounted unfavourable to its Theocritean authorship to that which has been accounted favourable, we find certain resemblances to passages in the authentic poems which persuaded Fritzsche that this was by the same hand. Fritzsche, however, could recognize T.'s signature in an anaphora of *aiei*,² while even more striking similarities³ will leave the less clairvoyant in doubt whether it is a single poet, or a poet and an imitator, whom they confront. C. Prinz, who has discussed these resemblances,⁴ thinks they support the view that *Id.* 25 is by T., but the only point which seems to me of much value is that there are some odd similarities between the fights of Herakles with the bull and the lion in *Id.* 25 and that of Polydeukes with Amykos in *Id.* 22.⁵ The themes of the resembling passages are widely dissimilar, and the resemblances, which are more of thought than of language, might therefore be held to suggest a common authorship rather than imitation by another hand. Still, though I agree with Prinz that the evidence is not unfavourable to any claim which might be advanced in favour of T.'s authorship of *Id.* 25, it does, and can do, little to establish it; and if I chose to base my opposition to such a claim on the absence of any good external evidence in its favour, I should be neither much heartened by Perrotta's support nor much discouraged by Prinz's hostility.⁶

The chief purpose of this paper is to draw attention to certain oversights or carelessnesses in the story told by the author of *Id.* 25, but before I proceed to them I shall glance at some with which he has been taxed by Wilamowitz.⁷ Wilamowitz argues that in Part 1 it is impossible to frame a question from Herakles to which the rustic's answer is appropriate, and also that the three parts do not fit accurately together. We cannot reconstruct, he says, what has passed between Herakles and Augeias in the interval between Parts 1 and 2, since in Part 3 Herakles is still an

¹ His strongest cases for Ap. Rh. 1 and 2 are 15 (1. 127), 20 (2. 733); for Ap. Rh. 3 and 4, 66 (3. 934, 1011), 110 (4. 731). Cumulatively his weaker instances strengthen the argument a little, but only a little. I add, since P. does not mention it, that the method by which Herakles acquires a club on Helikon (209) bears some resemblance to that by which he acquires an oar in Mysia (Ap. Rh. 1. 1196), and his handling of the aggressive bull (145) to Jason's handling of the fire-breathing bulls (Ap. Rh. 3. 1306).

P.'s argument (p. 261) that the borrower must be the author of *Id.* 25 because Apollonius was too eminent to borrow from an *ignoto bucolico* begs the question; and it would have little weight even if it were certain that to A. this poet was an *ignoto*. Besides, we do not know the relative dates of the poems.

² 123 compared with *Id.* 16. 1.

³ The most striking are probably between 19

and 24. 94, and between 168 and 13. 44.

⁴ *Diss. Phil. Vindob.* 5. 103 (cf. Perrotta, p. 219).

⁵ Compare *Id.* 25. 148, 259, 262 with *Id.* 22. 48 (cf. also 93, 124), 98, 129.

⁶ Prinz argued further that *epigr.* 4. 3 borrows the rare word *αὐτόφλοιον* from 25. 208, and *Id.* 9. 5 *ἀτιμαγεῖντες* from 25. 132 *ἀτιμαγέλαι*: and that as the authors of these spurious poems were imitators of T. they must have found *Id.* 25 among his works. Those who condemn *Id.* 8 may like to add to this evidence *βοῶν ἐπιούρος* (8. 6: 25. 1), but they must subtract *epigr.* 4 for there is no reason to suppose that its author is imitating T. I do not in any case think there is much weight in the argument. See also Legrand, *Étude*, 17.

⁷ *Textg.* 218. What follows amplifies and corrects some brief remarks of mine in *C.Q.* xxiv. 146.

unknown
to Phyl
however

The
Euryst
offered
but, on
task, d
the cas
drove l

At
asked t
(36). W
side an
and yo
housed
that al
find A
the rep
it prov
of a fri
therefo
Part 3
not kn
betwe
his na
cleansi
we can
and 3
Phyle
missec
the di
quarre
consis
that i
porate

¹ Ap
Pausan

pute;
but ju

² Cf

4. 89.

³ Ph
to the
Perseid
that th
with th
relevan

⁴ Th
for me
the Au
are lea
the fin

unknown stranger. His reference to Eurystheus at 205 will, therefore, be unintelligible to Phyleus, nor can we guess the errand which takes the two into the town. I think, however, that these difficulties are imaginary.

The story as told by Apollodorus and others is that Herakles was ordered by Eurystheus to cleanse Augeias' stalls in a day. Without disclosing this order he offered Augeias to do so for a tithe of the king's cattle; Augeias accepted the terms, but, on discovering that Herakles was in any case under an obligation to perform the task, denied that he had made the agreement and professed himself willing to submit the case to a court. Herakles called Phyleus as a witness, and Augeias in a passion drove both into exile.¹ Into this framework the narrative of the poem can be fitted.

At the beginning Herakles is (at least by implication) *ὄδοι ζαχρεῖος* (6). He has asked the way, then, but has not disclosed that it is Augeias whom he wants to see (36). What the rustic says (3 ff.) is: 'Augeias' sheep are distributed about the countryside and housed near their pastures. His cattle, however, all feed here by the river, and you can see their byres on the right among the trees. There too his labourers are housed, though the vine- and olive-dressers live at a distance—for you must know that all this countryside belongs to Augeias.' If Herakles has asked where he can find Augeias' estates or his cattle-byres (which are what he is primarily looking for) the reply answers the question. It gives a good deal of superfluous information, but it provides the poet with an opportunity for some effective writing, and in the mouth of a friendly and garrulous rustic it is dramatically not inappropriate. The beginning, therefore, is conceived with sufficient logic; and so also is the rest, for, though in Part 3 Phyleus addresses Herakles as *ξείνε* (162), we need not assume that he does not know his name.² He can, indeed, hardly fail to do so, for when, in the interval between Parts 1 and 2, Herakles presented himself to Augeias he must have disclosed his name and may have disclosed his lineage.³ Whether his agreement as to the cleansing of the king's byres precedes or follows the inspection of them in Part 2 we can hardly determine, though the latter is perhaps more likely. Between Parts 2 and 3 will certainly fall the accomplishment of the task and the quarrel with the king. Phyleus and Herakles are going off together in Part 3 because they have been dismissed together in anger. Naturally Phyleus will know about Eurystheus since it is the discovery of his interest in the cleansing of the stables which has caused the quarrel.⁴ The thesis which Wilamowitz was defending was that the poem does not consist of fragments from a longer work but is complete in itself, his argument being that it would have been impossible to construct the larger work which should incorporate these three sections. To the thesis I subscribe,⁵ but I think the poet, designing

¹ Apoll. 2. 5. 5, Call. *fr.* 383, Paus. 5. 1. 9. Pausanias assigns a different cause to the dispute; Callimachus makes Phyleus not witness but judge.

² Cf. for instance, 5. 66, *Od.* 19. 215, Ap. Rh. 4. 89.

³ Phyleus has some memory that according to the Achaean the slayer of the lion was a Perseid (173). It is not necessary to suppose that this helps him to identify his companion with the victor, but the detail has slightly more relevance if it does so.

⁴ Their conversation is no doubt light-hearted for men, or even for heroes, going into exile, but the Augeias-story is not the poet's theme. They are leaving the king's presence (for the town in the first instance) and it is enough that the

story should provide an occasion for their conversation. Neither here nor between Parts 1 and 2 is the reader invited to inquire further, though a sufficient answer is available should he do so.

⁵ The possibility that something is lost at the beginning should perhaps be left open, since in the edition of Callierges, where *Id.* 25 follows 24, the end of 24 and beginning of 25 are stated to be missing and the first statement has now been corroborated by *p. Ant.* The beginning of Part 1, however, seems securely fixed by the heading 'Ηρακλῆς πρὸς ἀγροῖκον which is likely to be original, and, if anything really preceded, it may have been another whole Part or something of a prefatory character.

his three booklets as parts of an imaginary epic, has imagined his epic clearly enough for them to be logically so thought of.

The oversights, if such they should be called, with which Wilamowitz taxed the poet concern the relationship of the separate parts of the poem. Those I am about to put together¹ are with one exception contained in Part 3, but one, which I take first, involves a reference to Part 1. According to the ploughman who describes Augeias' property the pastureland is in the water-meadows along the river, and there too are the farm-buildings (13 ff.). He continues (27):

οὐρους μὲν ἴσασι φυτοσκάφοι οἱ πολύεργοι
 ἐς ληνοὺς δ' ἰκνεῦνται ἐπὶν θέρος ὥριον ἔλθῃ.²
 πᾶν γὰρ δὴ πεδίον τόδ' ἐπίφρονος Αὐγείας,
 πυροφόροι τε γύαι καὶ ἄλλαι δενδρήσσαι,
 μέχρ' ἐπ' ἐσχατίας πολυπίδακος Ἀκρωρείης
 ὥς ἡμεῖς ἔργοισιν ἐποιοχόμεθα πρόπαν ἤμαρ.

The picture would seem, therefore, to be of a well-watered plain rising through a belt of cornland and orchards to vineyards and oliveyards on the surrounding hills.³ Yet Phyleus and his companion, making their way from the farm-buildings to the main road, do so by a foot-path ἡ ῥά δι' ἀμπελεῶνος ἀπὸ σταθμῶν τετάνυστο (157).⁴ There is perhaps no inconsistency which can be driven home, but the poet certainly invites Legrand's comment—*on ne s'attendait pas, après les explications du vieillard, à trouver un vignoble à proximité des étables*.

Before we leave it, this foot-path gives rise to another inconsistency, or, as it would perhaps be better to say, to a certain clumsiness, as though the poet had not very clearly focussed the setting of his dialogue. Herakles is walking behind Phyleus on the narrow path (160) so that conversation has been difficult or impossible. As soon as they reach the road where they can walk side by side Phyleus puts his question to Herakles, turning his head over his right shoulder. Seemingly he keeps it there for nearly thirty lines, for it is not until 189 that he steps from the middle of the road and makes room for his companion by his side. The picture of the man speaking over his shoulder to a comrade behind him is sharply observed,⁵ but if the conversation was not to begin until they reached the road on which they could walk abreast it should nevertheless have been suppressed.

The two remaining inconsistencies in Part 3 can be stated quite briefly. The Achaean stranger who told Phyleus about the death of the Nemean lion said it had been killed by an Argive *ἔθεν παρεόντος* (167), whereas it is abundantly clear from the narrative of Herakles that he was alone in an empty countryside at the time

¹ The majority have been noticed before by one scholar or another.

² On these two lines see *C.Q.* xxiv. 148.

³ Rostovtzeff (*Social and Econom. Hist.* 1190) thinks the poet gives a good picture of a large cattle-breeding estate in Hellenistic times, but 126 ff. do not inspire me (or, I think, Legrand) with much confidence in his practical knowledge of the subject.

⁴ In the following line, οὐτι λίην ἀρίστος ἐν ὕλῃ χλωρᾷ εἶοση, editors mostly accept Meineke's highly problematical χλωρὰ θεούση (χλωραθεούση J. A. Hartung, χλωρὰ θέουσα Cholmeley, χλωρᾷ ἰοῦσα Edmonds). I suppose they take the ὕλη to be the same as the ἀμπελεῶν, and, if a vineyard can be so called, I can imagine a foot-path

which is plain enough when the vine-stocks are bare but hard to pick out when they are in leaf. Ὑλη is also used of weeds (*Xen. Oec.* 16. 13, 17. 12, 14), and I can imagine a foot-path obscured by the growth of grass and weeds. I do not understand the line, but if either of these explanations is correct χλωρᾷ εἶοση is much preferable to the substitutes proposed. L. and S., at present in two minds between θέω (B) shine, gleam, and χλωραθέω gleam green, might in future confine themselves to the two passages on which Meineke's conjecture was based.

⁵ And none the worse phrased for the fact that the words once served very different purposes at *Od.* 20. 301, 19. 452.

(218 ff.). Legrand thinks the man was lying; Wilamowitz¹ cannot determine whether he is bragging² or whether the poet is guilty of an oversight. But there can be no real doubt. If the man was to lie the point must have been properly made; not in this helplessly inefficient way; and it is a point so utterly irrelevant that the poet cannot have meant to make it.

The second inconsistency is this. Herakles sets out in quest of the lion carrying his bow and a club he had made for himself on Helikon which is described at 207 as βάκτρον | εὐπαγὲς αὐτόφλοιον ἐπηρεφέος κοτίνου | ἔμμητρον. It is, therefore, of green and unseasoned wood.³ Yet when he breaks it over the lion's skull it is described as ῥόπαλον αὖτον (255). The inconsistency, though unimportant, leaps to the attentive eye.

Conscientious students of this journal are probably tired by now of hearing from me that an indifference to consistency in details which do not affect, or much affect, the main purpose of his poem is characteristic of Theocritus, for during the last quarter of a century I have often drawn attention to examples.⁴ I now remark that the oversights in this poem, if that is the right name to call them by, are very much in his manner. They are not, of course, his sign-manual, and I do not advance them as proving the poem to be T.'s—indeed I had better say explicitly that on the evidence available at present I see no means of forming a decided opinion on this point.⁵ I present them as a contribution to the evidence, but as a contribution of some weight. For whereas style at this date is, as I have said, to some extent a matter of deliberate choice, such oversights, which are not confined in T. to any one type of poem, are an idiosyncrasy. Their presence in this poem indicates that its author has in common with T. not a style but a habit, or even a defect, of mind.

I append three trifling notes on points of detail.

63. Herakles, when he arrives on the scene, is carrying χειροπληθὴ κορύνην. The adjective, suitably applied to stones and other objects which may lie in the hand,⁶ ought in a club to indicate no more than the thickness of the handle,⁷ which is no proper guide to the weight or size of the weapon. I draw no inference from the fact, but it is at least odd that this hero's club should evoke an almost identical catachresis at 13. 57 ῥόπαλον τό οἱ αἰὲν ἐχάνδανε δεξιτερὰ χεῖρ, for χανδάνειν, as I have remarked elsewhere,⁸ is inappropriate to an object retained, but not contained, in the grasp.

164. ἦλυθε γὰρ στεῖχων τις ἀπ' Ἀργεος ὡς νέος ἀκμήν (Π, μέσος ἀκμῆς Φ).
ἐνθάδ' Ἀχαιοὺς ἀνὴρ Ἑλικῆς ἐξ ἀγχιάλου.

The end of 164 is generally regarded as corrupt though there have been those who could believe that ὡς μέσος ἀκμῆς might mean *in medio aetatis flore*. To produce a similar sense Legrand writes, as a parenthesis, ἦν νέος ἀκμήν—*il était encore jeune*. But the man's age is quite irrelevant, and we expect, as Wilamowitz says, to be told when it was that he appeared at Elis. The answer to that question will be supplied

¹ Textg. 221.

² He did not claim to have assisted, apparently, for Phyleus seems to know that the lion's opponent was single-handed (181), but I do not see how *ἔθεν παρεόντος* can be construed into anything less than a claim to have been an eye-witness.

³ Antiph. fr. 220 ἔμμητρον ἀν' ἡ τὸ ξύλον, βλάστην ἔχει, Theophr. C.P. 5. 17. 2 τὰ ξύλα τὰ ἔμμητρα διαστρέφεται κατεργασμένα ἤδη μέχρι οὐδ' ἀν' τελείως ἀναξηρανθῇ; cf. H.P. 5. 5. 2. It is useless so to punctuate the sentence that ἔμμητρον shall belong to the following relative clause, for (apart from the false emphasis it

would thereby acquire) αὐτόφλοιον also implies that the club is of unseasoned wood; and nobody, I imagine, will prefer the variant *εὐμετρον*.

⁴ C.Q. xiii. 22, xxiv. 146, xxxii. 16, xxxvi. 109; C.R. lvi. 16.

⁵ This is Legrand's view also (*Étude*, 19; *Buc. gr.* ii. 71).

⁶ e.g. Xen. *Anab.* 3. 3. 17; Theophr. *H.P.* 4. 2. 7; Nic. *Theor.* 94.

⁷ So of javelins, Dion. Hal. 5. 46 ξύλα προμήκη τε καὶ χειροπληθὴ τριῶν οὐχ ἦττον ποδῶν, where the thickness of the shaft is denoted.

⁸ C.Q. xxxii. 11.

by Legrand's text if we regard ἦν not as third but as first person. One may wonder why the author should choose to interpose an interval which must at least cover some years between the visit of this stranger and that of the hero of his narrative, but that he did so is beyond dispute since Phyleus has just told us that he heard the tale πάλαι πάγχυ (162).¹ I can only suggest that he has in mind some chronology of the Labours of Herakles, for, though authorities differ as to their order, all put the Nemean Lion first and none puts the Stables of Augeias earlier than fifth.² Ἀκμήν in the sense of ἔτι does not occur elsewhere in epic, but there are other words in this poem of which that is true—for instance, φραδή (52), δλοσχερής (210), and κέρκος (243)—and though rare in poetry it is used by Theocritus (4. 60).

201. πάντας γὰρ πισῆας ἐπικλύζων ποταμός ὥς
λῆς ἄμοτον κεράϊζε.

The simile is of the kind lavishly illustrated by Vahlen (*Orhusc.* 1. 300, 2. 193) in which there is used of the object compared language appropriate only to that with which it is compared. We may therefore translate *the lion like a river in flood* rather than *the lion in flood like a river*. Still, the comparison is strange, and I think it possible to guess what suggested it. In the fifth ode of Bacchylides Meleagros, describing the ravages of the Calydonian boar, says (107) πλὴ μύρων σθένει | ὄρχους ἐπέκειρεν ὀδόντι, σφάζε τε μῆλα, βορῶν | θ' ὅστις εἰσάνταν μόλοι. He is conversing in Hades with Herakles who has come there in quest of Kerberos, and, meeting Meleagros, is about to shoot at him (73 νευρὰν ἐπέβασε λυγκλαγγῇ κορώνας) when the latter checks him with the warning that it is no use shooting at ghosts (81 μὴ ταῦσιον προῖει τραχὺν ἐκ χειρῶν ὀιστόν). The author of *Id.* 25 also uses the transitive tense of βαίνω, though somewhat differently, in connexion with archery (212 στρεπτῇ ἐπέλασσα κορώνῃ | νευρεῖν, περὶ δ' ἰὸν ἐχέστονον εἶθαρ ἔβησα); and he uses, too, the rare and somewhat mysterious word τηῦσιος of an ineffective shot (229 καὶ βάλλον ἄσπον ἰόντος ἀριστερόν ἐς κενεῶνα | τηυσίως). Since nobody else does either of these things, and since an ode on the crowning labour of Herakles may well be in the mind of a poet writing on his first and most famous, it does not seem unreasonable to assign to all three passages the same inspiration.

TRINITY COLLEGE,
CAMBRIDGE.

A. S. F. GOW.

¹ This point is overlooked by Edmonds, and by Platt who proposed (*J. Phil.* xxxiv. 146) ὅτ' ἄρ' θέρος ἦν μέσον ἀκμήν. The travels of this stranger seem aimless, but we cannot remove the Argolid from his route or we shall not know how he acquired his information about the death of the lion. It is also not plain at 209 what should take Herakles to Helikon, which is not on the way from Thebes to Nemea. According to *Σ* 13. 6 he once killed another lion there—but I suspect that the geography of the Greek mainland is not this poet's forte.

² See *R.E.* Suppl. 3. 1021. In Apollodorus,

who places Augeias fifth, the first four Labours are Lion, Hydra, Hind, Boar. A good deal of travelling is therefore involved, and if the chase of the Hind took the hero, as Pindar says (*O.* 3. 31), 'behind the North Wind', the year allotted to it by Apollodorus (2. 5. 3) is a moderate estimate.

However we account for the length of the interval, the fact that the poet allows one shows that he had considered the background of his scenes more carefully than Wilamowitz would admit.

1. BLOC

(i)

(ii)

Cucur

of Cucur

of the c

Mayor's

Thes. L

cite onl

the oth

a stupi

habere,

plausib

by suc

κυνένυ

which,

an inse

a pum

with th

typify

cucurbi

other e

In

sary el

certain

a trav

Trimal

are the

sort la

graphi

The p

Pliny

reason

¹ Fr

of the

cucurbi

the ab

glasses

² Fo

Schmi

p. 637

³ In

as in

quinte

⁴ Ja

dissert

sterda

SOME CUCURBITACEAE IN LATIN LITERATURE

I. BLOCKHEAD OR BALDHEAD?

- (i) Petron. *Sat.* 39. 12: 'in Aquario (nascuntur) copones et cucurbitae'.
- (ii) Apul. *Met.* I. 15: 'nos cucurbitae caput non habemus ut pro te moriamur'.

Cucurbita in its literal use is the name of many varieties of the numerous family of *Cucurbitaceae*, as one may learn, e.g. from Plin. *Nat. Hist.* xix. It is also the name of the cupping instrument called by Juvenal, xiv. 58, *uentosa cucurbita*, for which see Mayor's note ad loc. For other metaphorical uses of the name, Forcellini and the *Thes. Ling. Lat.* cite only the two passages quoted above; of these two, Lewis and Short cite only the former. Lexicographers and editors,¹ comparing the one passage with the other, concur in the view that the *cucurbita* is the symbol of stupidity, and that a stupid man may be called a *cucurbita*, as in Petronius, or be said *cucurbitae caput habere*, as in Apuleius. At first sight their interpretation of the Apuleian phrase is plausible, for it makes tolerable sense in the context and appears to be supported by such modern expressions as 'pumpkin-head' and *Kürbiskopf* and *κεφάλι κολοκυνθένιον*,² all of which liken the head of a stupid man to a pumpkin or other gourd which, though bearing some resemblance to a human head,³ encloses not a brain but an insensate mass of pulp and seeds. But 'to have a pumpkin-head' and 'to be a pumpkin' are *prima facie* very different, for the latter equates the man himself with the *cucurbita*, whereas it is only *qua* substitute for a head that the *cucurbita* can typify stupidity; and when it is further observed that in the Petronian passage *cucurbitae* so interpreted accords ill with the context, it becomes clear that some other explanation must be sought.

In Petronius 39 Trimalchio proves his knowledge of the *philologia* which is necessary *etiam inter cenandum* by naming in order the twelve signs of the Zodiac and certain creatures which are born under each sign. The whole exposition, of course, is a travesty⁴ of popular astrology, with a joke in every item. In *Aquario*, says Trimalchio, are born *copones et cucurbitae*. The *copones* present no difficulty: they are the proverbially fraudulent innkeepers who put too much water in the wine, the sort lampooned in the Pompeian graffito *C.I.L.* iv. 3948 (Buecheler, *Carmina Epigraphica*, 930)

talia te fallant utinam me(n)dacia, copo:

tu ue(n)dēs acuam et bibēs ipse merum.⁵

The primary reason for bringing *cucurbitae* under Aquarius is no less obvious, for as Pliny says (*N.H.* xix. 24. 69), they *amant rigua*; but that there is also a secondary reason turning on some humorous use of *cucurbita* as a designation of persons⁶ is

¹ Friedlaender is an exception. In his version of the *Cena Trimalchionis*, l.c., he translates *cucurbitae* 'Kürbisse' and, in a footnote, offers the absurd alternative 'Schöpfköpfe' ('cupping-glasses').

² For the modern Greek phrase see Bernhard Schmidt, *Rhein. Mus.*, N.F. xxxiii (1878), p. 637 f.

³ In vulgar French *coloquinte* is used for *tête*, as in the phrase *un coup de poing sur la coloquinte*.

⁴ Jacques de Vreese, in his long and laborious dissertation *Petron 39 und die Astrologie* (Amsterdam, 1927), falls into the fatal error of taking

Trimalchio's astrology seriously. The value and interest of his work consist not in the elucidation of Petronius 39 but in the collection and marshalling of astrological lore.

⁵ The metrically sound original of this couplet was probably

talia te fallant utinam mendacia, copo:
nobis uendis aquam, tu bibis ipse merum.

The omission of *n* before a dental is found elsewhere; the substitution of *ē* for *i* is common.

⁶ In Trimalchio's catalogue only persons are specified as being born in the several signs, excepting the *bigae* and *boues* which are born

proved by the whole series of jokes in the context. One reason for rejecting the current interpretation 'blockheads', *homines inepti*, namely that it involves the comparison of the man himself, and not merely of his head, with a *cucurbita*, has been set out above. A second and not less cogent reason is that Trimalchio has already accounted for blockheads, bringing them under Taurus. 'Deinde', he has said (§ 6), 'totus caelus taurulus fit; itaque tunc calcitrosi nascuntur et bubulci et qui se ipsi pascunt.' Lexicographers, editors, translators, and expositors seem without exception to have missed the double significance of *bubulci*, recognizing in it only the literal sense and denying to Petronius the jest demanded both by the jocular *calcitrosi* and *qui se ipsi pascunt* which flank it and by the character of the whole context. The *bubulci* are yokels not only literally but also metaphorically. The Latin *bubulcus*, no less than the English 'yokel', connotes a dull-witted, stupid fellow, a 'blockhead', as in *Iuv. Sat. vii. 115 ff.* 'surgis tu pallidus Aiax | dicturus dubia pro libertate bubulco | iudice', where *bubulco* is pointless unless it connotes stupidity. But if *bubulci*, born in Taurus, are blockheads, the *cucurbitae*, born not in Taurus but in Aquarius, must represent some other type. What this other type was may be inferred with certainty from Apuleius.

In the *Metamorphoses*, I. 5-19, Apuleius tells the gruesome tale of Aristomenes and Socrates; how Meroe and her sister witch, breaking into the inn in which Aristomenes is sheltering his distressed friend, tear out Socrates' heart, befoul Aristomenes, and disappear into the night. At the first signs of approaching dawn (14 ad fin.: *nox ibat in diem*) Aristomenes, fearing that he may be charged with the murder, resolves to escape before it is light, rouses the sleeping janitor, and bids him unbar the outer door. But the janitor "quid? tu", inquit, "ignoras latronibus infestari uias, qui hoc noctis iter incipis? nam etsi tu alicuius facinoris tibi conscius scilicet mori cupis, nos cucurbitae caput non habemus, ut pro te moriamur." And though Aristomenes protests 'non longe lux abest', the janitor presently rolls over to his other side and goes to sleep again. The insistence on the hour—*nox ibat in diem . . . non longe lux abest*—is significant, as we shall see. The clue to the meaning of *cucurbitae caput non habemus* will be found in *Apul. Met. v. 9 fin.*, where one of Psyche's jealous sisters complains that she has drawn in the matrimonial lottery *maritum . . . cucurbita caluiorem*, a husband older than her father and 'balder than a gourd'. In i. 15 the order of words is against the view that the janitor denies his possession of *cucurbitae caput*, but let that pass. He does in fact acknowledge possession. He does not mean 'I am not so stupid as to die instead of you', but 'I am not as bald as a gourd in order that I may die instead of you'. The humour of the incident is thoroughly Apuleian. The old janitor imagines that at this very moment there are robbers outside. If he opens the door they will burst in and, seeing nothing in the dark interior but his bald pate gleaming faintly in the early half-light, will make instant onslaught on this as the only conspicuous target, so that he and not Aristomenes will be their victim.¹ The janitor is only a minor character in an introductory episode, but this one deft stroke of the *cucurbitae caput*, added with truly Apuleian art, sets him alive and visible

in *Geminis*; and even these are at any rate living creatures: the *bigae* teams of two horses or other animals, the *boues* oxen yoked in pairs for ploughing or draught. The *colei* which are also brought under Gemini are not *colei* in the literal sense but *hirneosi*, one of the commonest butts of ancient wit, as appears plainly from Martial, xii. 83 'derisor Fabianus hirmearum, | omnes quem modo colei timebant | dicentem tumidas in hydrocelas, | . . . | in thermis subito Neronianis | uidit se miser, et tacere coepit'. Hey in

the *Thes. Ling. Lat. s.v. coleus* says that in these passages of Petronius and Martial the word is used *metonymice, ut uidetur, de personis*, but offers no interpretation.

¹ This disposes of Leo's view, mentioned with evident approval by Helm (*ed. Teubn.*, ad loc.), that the words *nam nos . . . moriamur* cannot be spoken by the janitor but belong properly to some companion or servant of Aristomenes, and that accordingly Apuleius—an excellent Greek scholar—must have mistranslated his original.

before
namely
and in
the lov
lamente
person

Of
Day ha
the Soc
ianitor
a me c
'pater'
man, a
et pater
these v
pater fo
proper
present
and co
janitor

To
baldnes
another
externa
cucurbi
bitae ca
ineptus
univers
the cur
cerebros

In t
cucurbi
has bee
express
mean a
for cuc
in Apul

2. THE

Ther
satire o
analogy
a gourd
of the r
posed o

(1) T
related i

¹ One
tello's ba
at Floren

² Suet.
eum (sc.

before us. Examples of the like are many in the *Metamorphoses*; I cite only one, namely ix. 27 init., where the miller's groom, making only a momentary appearance and introduced for the sole purpose of leading the Ass past the trough under which the lover lies concealed, is called *senex claudus*: not because either his age or his lameness is significant, but merely in order that the reader may see him as a real person.

Of this interpretation of *cucurbitae caput* there is confirmation in the context. Day has come, and Aristomenes, overjoyed to find alive, and apparently unharmed, the Socrates whom he had seen foully slain, cries out to the janitor (i. 17 med.) 'ecce, janitor fidelissime et pater meus, comes et frater meus quem nocte ebrius occisum a me calumniabaris', where *pater* and *frater* are used as in Hor. *Epist.* i. 6. 54 ('*frater*', '*pater*' adde) and elsewhere. Addressed as *pater meus*, the janitor is evidently an old man, and because he is old he is also bald. The MSS. set *comes* in this passage before *et pater meus*, thereby producing nonsense, and editors since Salmasius have excluded these words as a dittography of *et frater meus* with an unexplained substitution of *pater* for *frater*; but the simple and obviously right remedy is to restore *comes* to its proper place before *et frater meus*. With a humorous flourish that accords with his present high spirits—so soon to be dashed—Aristomenes presents his young friend and companion Socrates to his venerable (though lately tipsy) senior the trusty janitor.

To Apuleius, then, that utterly hairless fruit the *cucurbita* is the very type of baldness.¹ So also to Petronius. Trimalchio's *cucurbitae* are *calui*, 'baldheads', another familiar butt of ancient wit. As the comparison now proves to be one of externals, of the hairlessness of the man (or of his head) with the hairlessness of a *cucurbita*, there is no longer any difficulty in the equation *cucurbitam esse = cucurbitae caput habere*. Of *cucurbita*, with or without *caput*, as an equivalent of *homo ineptus* there is no trace in Latin, perhaps because in antiquity there was not that universal recognition of head and brain as the seat of the intelligence which explains the currency of 'pumpkin-head', 'Kürbiskopf', and so on, to-day. In Latin the *cerebrosus* is not 'brainy' but 'choleric'.

In the foregoing discussion I have quoted the Apuleian passage with the reading *cucurbitae caput* found in all MSS. and accepted without question by editors. This has been interpreted as though it were *cucurbitam capitis*, 'a gourd of a head', an expression like *portentum hominis*, *iniuria cenae*, and so forth,² but could scarcely mean anything but 'a head of a gourd', which in the context is nonsense. I propose for *cucurbitae* the correction **cucurbitale*, 'gourd-like': the formation is regular, and in Apuleius one more ἀπαξ λεγόμενον need excite no surprise.

2. THE APOCOLOCYNTOSIS

There is no reason to doubt either that Seneca, as Dio Cassius³ affirms, called his satire on Claudius by the name 'Αποκολοκύντωσις or that this title, formed on the analogy of ἀποθέωσις, signifies the transformation of Claudius not into a god but into a gourd, but scholars have failed to find any convincing or even plausible explanation of the name. The explanations hitherto offered may be classified and, I think, disposed of, as follows:

(1) *The work as we have it is incomplete, and the metamorphosis into a gourd was related in the part that has not survived.*

¹ One may compare the Italian *succa*. Donatello's bald-headed figure on Giotto's campanile at Florence is popularly known as *Il Zuccone*.

² Suet. *Claud.* iii. 2 'mater Antonia portentum eum (sc. Claudium) hominis dicitabat'; Iuv.

Sat. v. 9 'tantine iniuria cenae?'

³ Epit. lx. 35 συνέθηκε . . . ὁ Σενέκας σύγγραμμα ἀποκολοκύντωσιν αὐτὸ ὥσπερ τινα ἀπαθανάτισιν δομάσας.

This is only another way of saying that the title is inexplicable. In point of fact, there is no composition in all Latin literature which bears more plainly all the marks of a carefully schemed and rounded whole: Claudius, rejected from heaven and escorted by way of Rome to the underworld, is sentenced there by the infernal powers to a suitable and everlasting punishment and, in order that insult may be added to injury, is required to serve his sentence in the degraded condition of a slave.

(2) *The joke to be presumed in the title 'Apocolocyntosis' is limited to the title itself.*

In other words, Seneca, though neither a fool nor a novice in literature, gave to his satire an inappropriate name. What reputable writer, in any age, has been guilty of such ineptitude? As well might Milton have called *Paradise Lost* 'The Pumpkinification of Satan'.

(3) *The name suggests the transmutation of a stupid Claudius into a κολοκύντη (cucurbita, gourd) which is the symbol of stupidity.*

But (i) there is no mention in the satire of any such transmutation; (ii) no emphasis is laid on the stupidity of Claudius, of which indeed there is no mention whatever in the invective of Augustus which leads to the expulsion from heaven, nor in the funeral dirge, nor during the proceedings in the underworld; (iii) the gourd, as I have shown in the first part of this article, is not, in Latin, a symbol of stupidity, nor have I been able to find, in Greek, any trace of κολοκύντη with that signification. Nor again does *cucurbita* = *caluus* give any help: if Claudius is changed into a gourd, literally or metaphorically, it is not because he is or becomes bald; he possesses a fine head of white hair¹ and, so far as we learn, retains it to the end.

The quest of the true explanation must therefore proceed from the assumptions (1) that the work is complete; (2) that the title has some propriety; and (3) that, as a corollary of (2), the justification of the title exists in the work itself. And since there is no literal ἀποκολοκύντωση of Claudius, the transformation into a κολοκύντη can only be metaphorical.

About the title *Apocolocyntosis* there is an air of finality: if a man after death achieves *apotheosis*, becomes a god, there is an end of the matter: his destiny is accomplished; and similarly, if he suffers *apocolocyntosis*, becomes a gourd, that again is the end of him; and since it is only at the end of the narrative that the final fate of Claudius is revealed, it is there that the significance of the name must be sought. In the last two chapters, 14-15, we read that Claudius is brought before Aeacus, and that Aeacus, *homo iustissimus*, condemns him without hearing counsel for the defence, having decided 'to let the punishment fit the crime':

αἶκε πάθοι τά τ' ἔρεξε, δίκη κ' ἰθεὶα γένοιτο.

Proposals that he take the place of Sisyphus or Tantalus or Ixion, setting one of these free from his agelong punishment, are rejected on the ground that the precedent would be bad: Claudius must not be allowed ever to hope for pardon and release. A new punishment must be devised: some vain labour, some fruitless and unending appearance of satisfying a craving. Aeacus passes sentence. As the 'billiard sharp' in Gilbert's *Mikado* is condemned to play billiards on

A cloth untrue
With a twisted cue
And elliptical billiard balls,

so Aeacus condemns the gamester Claudius *alea ludere pertuso fritillo*, to indulge eternally his passion for gaming, but with a perforated *fritillus* that will not hold the dice. And before the sentence was pronounced Claudius was already trying to recover

¹ *Apoc.* 5. 2 *bene canum*; cf. Suet. *Claud.* 30 *specie canitieque pulchra*.

the esca
by the c
the Sac

the chie
concuss
further
arte lib

Here
it. The
a dice-b
The inv
in the u
which H
Safinius
the grow
is *codex*
in the
chelidon
title *Ap*
that th
end, res

This
was so
punishm
specific
a suffic
and the
is broug
and Ma
φίμος ('
which o
used so
of the c
reason

¹ So I
interpret
only aut
quiduis
dicta in
which is
as epith
no other
centurie
likely to
contrary
sicca, so
has hus
riched h

the escaping dice. That is the climax of the whole satire, and we are prepared for it by the climax of the dirge chanted for Claudius as his funeral procession passes along the Sacra Via (12 ad fin.):

caedite maestis pectora palmis
o cauidici, uenale genus;
uosque poetae lugete noui,
uosque in primis qui concusso
magna parastis lucra fritillo:

the chief mourners for the dead Emperor are his fellow gamesters, enriched, like him, *concusso fritillo*. For the addiction of Claudius to gaming with dice we have the further evidence of Suetonius (*Claud.* 33 fin.): 'aleam studiosissime lusit, de cuius arte librum quoque emisit, solitus etiam in gestatione ludere'.

Here, then, we must look for the solution of the problem, and here we shall find it. The gourd into which Claudius is changed, metaphorically, is a gourd used as a dice-box; in effect, the *Apocolocyntosis* is the 'Fritillification' of the Deified Claudius. The inveterate gamester, everlastingly rattling the dice, is condemned to become, in the underworld, a *fritillus* incarnate, a very personification of the instrument with which he indulged his disreputable passion: he is to be *fritillus*, *non homo*, much as Saffinius in Petronius 44. 7, who was such 'hot stuff' that wherever he went he singed the ground, is *piper*, *non homo*, 'pepper incarnate', or as Fortunata in Petronius 74. 13 is *codex*, *non mulier*, 'an animated ledger'.¹ In Juvenal, *Sat. vi, Frag. Ox.* 6, discussed in the last part of this article, there is similar personification of *colocyntha* and *chelidon*; in Mart. *Epigr.* xi. 92 Zoilus is *non uitiosus homo . . . sed uitium*. That the title *Apocolocyntosis* is puzzling is not to be denied, but Seneca, no doubt, intended that the reader should be puzzled. With sound art, he maintains the suspense to the end, reserving the solution of the mystery to the last page of his satire.

This interpretation, involving the assumption that the use of gourds as *fritilli* was so common that a contemporary reader could not fail to infer from Claudius' punishment the meaning and aptness of the title *Apocolocyntosis*, rests not on any specific statement in literature nor on any recognizable representation in art, but on a sufficiently firm basis of probabilities. What information we possess about *fritilli* and the kinds of dice-box called *turricula* (πύργος, *pyrgus*), *phimus* (φίμος), and so on is brought together and documented by Daremberg and Saglio (*Dict. Ant.* ii. 1341 f.) and Mau (*Pauly-Wissowa*, 13, Halbband 108-10, s.v. *fritillus*). The *turricula* and *φίμος* ('muzzle') were named from their respective shapes, and had other features which distinguished them from the ordinary *fritillus*, though *fritillus* may have been used sometimes as a generic term to include the others. That *fritillus* was the name of the common, everyday, unsophisticated dice-box is certain. Perhaps for that very reason no classical writer has described it. Why describe what was so familiar? We

¹ So I interpret the phrase. For the vulgate interpretation of *codex* as 'dolt', 'blockhead', the only authority cited is Ter. *H.T.* 876 f. 'in me quiduis harum rerum conuenit | quae sunt dicta in stulto, caudex stipes asinus plumbeus', which is far from proving that *caudex* or *codex*, as epithet or description of a person, can have no other meaning even after the lapse of two centuries. Nor is even an angry Trimalchio likely to have called Fortunata stupid. On the contrary, she is a highly intelligent woman, *sicca*, *sobria*, *bonorum consiliorum* (37. 7) who has husbanded Trimalchio's resources and enriched him (*ibid.*) and, generally, served as his

invaluable factotum (*ibid.*) She is first seen (37. 1) scurrying about, attending to household affairs, too busy to join the dinner-party. In 67. 1-2, when Habinnas asks why she has not come to dinner, Trimalchio replies, with evident pride in his jewel of a wife, 'nisi argentum composierit, nisi reliquias pueris diuiserit, aquam in os suum non coniciet'; and presently, when she has come to table, she is praised for *diligentia matris familiae* (67. 11). It is her addiction to housekeeping which causes an angry and ungrateful husband to name her from the *codex*, housekeeping-book, which she bears with her always as her badge of office.

may safely reject the statements of the Scholiast *ad Iuv. Sat.* xiv. 5 that the (normal) *fritillus*, identified by him with the *phimus*, was a *pyxis cornea* and that *apud antiquos* the (normal) dice-box was a horn. Representations in art give no indication of material and, since the implement is grasped in the hand, little indication of shape. The identification as *fritilli* of some small earthenware vessels found at Pompeii is possible, according to Mau, l.c. (who, however, does not describe them), but not certain.

What, then, may we be said to know about the *fritillus*?

(1) It is a hollow implement *in quo*, as Porphyrio says *ad Hor. Sat.* ii. 7. 15, *coniectae tesserae agitataeque miltuntur*.

(2) It has no handle, and is small enough in circumference to be grasped conveniently in the hand, but big enough to permit free movement of the dice within it. These features, probable in themselves, are confirmed, e.g. by the evidence of the Pompeian painting¹ on which *C.I.L.* iv. 3494 *e* and *f* are inscribed.

(3) It has no device, such as the internal ridges of the *turricula*, to prevent a dishonest player from controlling the fall of the dice. This is a natural inference from Martial, xiv. 16, a couplet written to accompany the gift of a *turricula*:

quae scit compositos manus improba mittere talos,
si per me misit, nil nisi uota facit:

the *manus improba*, using an ordinary *fritillus*, can determine dishonestly the fall of the dice, but, using the *turricula*, 'can only pray' for a lucky cast.² The object figured as a *fritillus* by Daremberg and Saglio is probably a *turricula*.

(4) It is made of a resonant material, as appears from Sen. *Apoc.* 15 init. *resonante fritillo*, Mart. iv. 14. 7 f. 'December | incertis sonat hinc et hinc fritillis' and, especially, Mart. v. 84. 3 ff. 'male proditus fritillo, | arcana modo raptus e popina, | aedilem rogat udus aleator', where the rattle of the dice, proceeding from a pothouse remote from the street, is heard at a distance by a passing officer of the law. The name *fritillus* itself points to this resonance as a constant characteristic.³

No doubt a variety of materials and a variety of shapes were in use, but it is clear that all the conditions set out above would be admirably satisfied by the dry husk of a small bottle-gourd (*Cucurbita lagenaria* Linn.).⁴ Both wild and cultivated gourds grew in great profusion, as we may learn, e.g., from Pliny's chapters in *Nat.*

¹ There is a drawing of this in Gusman's *Pompéi*, p. 240.

² This is evidently the meaning. It would be small praise of a *turricula*, as ensuring honesty, to contrast it with the hand of the gamester, even if it were at all likely that, when play was for stakes, dice were thrown, unless in exceptional circumstances, directly from the hand. The contrast is with the common sort of dice-box. Friedlaender, W. Gilbert, Duff (*C.P.L.*), Lindsay (*O.C.T.*), and Heraeus (*Teubn.*) all accept, against MSS. and grammar and sense, Schneidewin's conjecture *feret* (for *facit*), which is derived from the variant *feret* found in a single manuscript. The perfect *misit* is well used: the *uota* of the gamester are made in the moment of suspense between the discharge of the dice and their coming to rest on the gaming-board.

³ I see no reason for doubting the derivation from *fritinnio*. As the masc. noun *capulus* was formed on the verb *capio*, so was **fritinnulus*

formed on the verb *fritinnio*, and this, by syncope and assimilation, produced *fritillus*; one may compare *catinulus* > *catillus*, **coronula* > *corolla*, **personula* > *persolla*. The nature of the sound represented by *fritinnio* has made some etymologists hesitate, since it is sometimes the chirping of birds, a sound not very close to that produced by the shaking of dice. But the author of the *Carmen de Philomela* (Baehrens, *P.L.M.* v, p. 365) says that *rauca cicada fritinit*, and no one who is familiar with cicadas can fail to recognize both the aptness of *rauca* and the frequent likeness of their noise to that of shaken dice. In English we speak of the 'rattle' of dice; an Australian child, if asked why he takes a cicada in his hand and shakes it, will say 'to make him "rattle" '.

⁴ For information about gourds in antiquity I refer to Orth's article, s.v. 'Kürbis' in Pauly-Wissowa, xi. 2, 2104-5.

Hist. xi.
part of
of vesse
for the
of which
be both
as cont
purpose

The
Roman
to limit
go to th
cutting
pear-sh
the top
loudly,
passage
and son
as that
Claudiu
a dama
wont to

Hay
Proven
in form
grapher
regarde
coincid

Pro
gourdo
gord, c
spelling
quotes
gourds
dry bo
gourd a
examp
pechon

The
second
the OF
gourdo
I have
lands a
one im
mediat
philolo
seem to

¹ One m

Hist. xix, and the Romans, like many other peoples, ancient and modern, over a great part of the world, made of them with little labour and at practically no cost a variety of vessels. Pliny (op. cit. xix. 24. 71-3) mentions specifically *urcei*, wine-jars, vessels for the storage of seeds, and, without specification, articles of *rustica supellex*, for all of which the husks of mature gourds were 'cured' in smoke. These were intended to be both useful and lasting; but there is no reason to suppose that the uses of gourds as containers were restricted to those actually mentioned by Pliny, nor that for all purposes smoking or other 'curing' of the husk was practised.

The vice or amusement of gaming with dice was prevalent among all classes of Romans, old and young, rich and poor; so prevalent indeed that the law intervened to limit indulgence. Why should a humble, impecunious person, a slave for instance, go to the expense of buying a *fritillus* when excellent substitutes, to be had for the cutting or picking up, grew or lay all about him? I have before me as I write an old pear-shaped gourd, picked up in a garden where it had lain for six months, which, if the top were cut off, would make a perfect dice-box. The dry seeds within it rattle loudly,¹ like a set of dice, when it is shaken, the neck is wide enough to allow the passage of dice, and, as it happens, a crack and a small hole in the thin, non-fibrous, and somewhat brittle shell of the old gourd give warning of just such a 'pertusion' as that of the *fritillus* with which Claudius is to play. It is part of the degradation of Claudius that, reduced to the status of an ex-slave's slave, he is condemned to use a damaged specimen of the sort of *fritillus* with which slaves and other 'riff-raff' were wont to play.

Having thus explained *Apocolocyntosis*, I draw attention to the existence in Provençal and Elizabethan English of words associated with dice which are identical in form with the words which in those languages represent the Lat. *cucurbita*. Lexicographers, entering these separately and suggesting no etymology, have apparently regarded them as distinct words, of unknown origin; but it will be conceded that the coincidence, if it is no more than coincidence, is very remarkable.

Provençal, according to Mistral, *Dictionnaire provençal-français*, has two words *gourdo*, of which the first, feminine = Fr. *gourde* and the second, masculine ('angl. *gord*, *dé*), means *osselet*, *jeu d'osselets*. The *O.E.D.*, s.v. 'Gourd'² (with variant spellings *gord* and *gorde*), defines this now obsolete word as 'a kind of false dice' and quotes, among other examples, 1592 *Nobody and Somebody* 'Heares fulloms and gourds; heeres tall-men and low-men'; Beaumont and Fletcher, *Scornful Lady*, 'Thy dry bones can reach at nothing now, but gords or ninepinnes'. It compares 'O.F. *gourd* a swindle, "fourberie", of which Godefroy has one example'. Godefroy's one example (*Dict. de l'anc. langue française*) is '2 Gourd, s.m., fourberie: "et sortoit de pechonnerie, toutefois entervoit le *gourd*" (1596)'.

The English 'gourd' or 'gord', used of dice, may well have been borrowed from the second Provençal *gourdo*, and perhaps some relationship subsists between this and the OF. *gourd* (masc.) = 'fourberie' cited by Godefroy. But what is the origin of *gourdo*? Is it again, in spite of the difference of gender, the Lat. *cucurbita*? Unless I have been imagining a vain thing, gourds were used anciently in Mediterranean lands as dice-boxes; and a development of meaning from 'dice-box' to 'die', from the one implement of gaming to the other, with the game itself ('jeu d'osselets') as intermediate stage, does not seem impossible. Having myself no expertness in Romance philology, I can venture no further; but the new line of inquiry here suggested may seem to some worth pursuing.

¹ One may suspect that among poor people the *crepitaculum* of a baby was often a small dry gourd.

3. COLOCYNTHA AND QUINTIO

The Oxford fragment of Juvenal's sixth Satire (365¹ ff.) begins with the verses

in quacumque domo uiuit luditque professus
obscenum, tremula promittit et omnia dextra,
inuenies omnis turpes similesque cinaedis.
his uiolare cibos sacraeque adistere mensae
5 permittunt, et uasa iubent frangenda lauari
cum colocyntha bibit uel cum barbata chelidon.

On the last of these Housman's remarks '*colocynthae* nomine os impurum significari perspicuum est; ac pro ore cunnilingi colocyntham siue *σικάνη*² poni posse colligitur ex eis quae de cucurbitae usu medico ab Hippocrate tradita sunt ed. Foes. 263, 16 . . 581, 37 . . 680, 43'; he says further that '*barbata chelidon* cunnus est, . . . hic autem per translationem ponitur pro ore fellatoris'.

As the medical use of the *colocyntha* mentioned by Hippocrates in the three passages cited by Housman is the thrusting of the gourd, as a pessary, *ἐς τὴν μήτηρ* of the patient, an operation which can have been within the experience only of a very small proportion of women, it is scarcely credible that this can have given rise to any metaphorical use of *colocyntha* in popular slang, which derives its metaphors from the familiar. Nor is it easy to find any resemblance between a gourd and an *os*, which is a mere cavity, nor, for that matter, between a rounded, rigid gourd and a flat, flexible *lingua*. Clearly, as Housman himself suspected, '*alia quaerenda est explicatio*'. His explanation of *barbata chelidon* is no more satisfactory. For the well-attested use of *chelidon* = *cunnus* it is enough to refer to Housman's examples, and, as he shows, of *chelidon* thus used *barbata* is an intelligible epithet; but if, as he supposed, we have the truly astonishing metonymy *chelidon* = *os fellatoris*, the epithet *barbata* has no propriety whatsoever, since the moustached or bearded *fellator* is neither fouler nor less foul than the shaven.

Housman seems to have allowed this interpretation to be forced on him by two passages which he quotes for the illustration of *uasa frangenda* (l. 5), namely Mart. xii. 74, 9-10 'hoc quoque non nihil est, quod propinabis in istis, | frangendus fuerit si tibi, Flacce, calix' and *Anth. Pal.* xi. 39 *ἐχθές μοι συνέπινε γυνή, περὶ ἧς λόγος ἔρρει | οὐχ ὄνις· παῖδες, θραύσατε τὰς κύλικας*. In each of these the hint at an *os impurum* is evident. But the resemblance between these and Juvenal's lines is no more than verbal. The context shows that Juvenal refers not to a literal, physical pollution, but to the lack, in those whom he is assailing, of that sense of pollution which is felt by normal, decent people in the presence of the debased or obscene. The frequenters of the house are *similes cinaedis* (l. 3), but there is no danger that *cinaedi* who are allowed (l. 4) *uiolare cibos sacraeque adistere mensae* will communicate to others a physical pollution; the *lanista*, who in l. 7 is contrasted as being *prior meliorque*, does not segregate the members of his troupe from one another for fear of some personal and communicable impurity. And so again in Satire viii. Caesar, in quest of his *legatus*, will find him in a *popina* at Ostia (ll. 173-8)

aliquo cum percussore iacentem,
permixtum nautis et furibus ac fugitiuis
inter carnifices et fabros sandapilarum

¹ In his edition of Juvenal *in usum editorum* (Grant Richards, 1905).

² Though Theophrastus distinguishes between *κολοκύννη* and *σικία* (e.g. i. 13, 3 *καὶ ἡ κολοκύννη καὶ ἡ σικία*), the difference is only one of species.

Pliny, borrowing from Theophrastus, calls both of them *cucurbita*: for *σικία* compare Theophr. vii. 3, 5 with Plin. xix. 24, 70; for *κολοκύννη* compare Theophr. i. 12, 2 with Plin. xix. 61, 186.

The leg
to have
in the p
suggest
in the
propina
client a
abomin
Hermen
manu i
'intellex
occidiss
revulsio

Juv
chelidon
personi
names
points
exact p
C.I.L.
in very
of graff
though
to the
cf. C.I.
and the

Since
conject
were fa
the lon
that re
κύνθη a
in vulg
eviden
postula
(1)

¹ For
x. 90, 1
woman

² The
quintio,
χελειδών
of α fo
inscripti
-δότη and
α for ε
the first

et resupinati cessantia tympana galli.
 aequa ibi libertas, communia pocula, lectus
 non alius cuiquam, nec mensa remotior ulli.

The *legatus* is attacked because he keeps the lowest of company, by which he ought to have been repelled, in a free-and-easy association which even includes, like that in the passage of the sixth Satire, *communia pocula*; but there is not the faintest suggestion that *communia pocula* are condemned because the kinds of ruffian specified in the catalogue must be presumed to be *oris impuri*. In Sat. v. 127-9 'quando propinat | Virro tibi sumitque tuis contacta labellis | pocula?', the patron treats his client as 'so much dirt', but is not to be understood as suspecting him of sexual abominations. Similarly there is no question of actual physical contamination when Hermeros in Petron. 37. 3 says of Fortunata 'et modo modo quid fuit? . . . noluisse de manu illius panem accipere', or when Niceros in Petron. 62. 13 says of the werewolf 'intellexi illum uersipellem esse, nec postea cum illo panem gustare potui, non si me occidisses'. The general idea underlying all of these passages is that of the moral revulsion which we express in the phrase 'I wouldn't touch him with a forty-foot pole'.

Juvenal's *colocyntha* is a salacious man, *membrosior aequo* (*Priap.* i. 5); his *barbata chelidon*¹ is a woman both unchaste and without bodily refinement; the one is a personified *membrum virile*, the other a personified *pudendum muliebre*; that both names were vulgar slang is clear. For *χελιδών* = *cunnius* Housman quotes Suidas and points to the riddling use of *χελιδόνες* = *γυναῖκες* in Aristoph. *Lys.* 770 ff.; but for an exact parallel to Juvenal's use of the word we must go to the Pompeian inscription C.I.L. iv. 2498 (Tab. xxxix. 22) ΛΟΛΛΙΑ ΧΕΙΛΕΙΔΩΝ. This was chiselled deeply, in very large letters, in a stone of the town walls, but belongs essentially to the class of graffiti. The editors of C.I.L. iv give *χειλειδών* a place in their *Index Cognominum*, though it is evidently an abusive epithet, equivalent to *fututrix* or *scortum*, attached to the name of a possibly respectable woman²; for similar abuse similarly expressed, cf. C.I.L. iv. 1388 a *Timele* (= *Thymele*) *extahiosa* (= *pathica*), 4196 *Miduse fututrix*, and the many other examples recorded in C.I.L. iv.

Since Juvenal's use of *colocyntha* is not found elsewhere, one must fall back on conjecture, though conjecture is here supported by adequate evidence. As gourds were familiar objects of everyday use in Greek and Roman lands and, especially in the longer-necked varieties, are highly phallic in form,³ there is an *a priori* probability that recognition of this resemblance gave rise to a vulgar use of *κολοκύνθη* or *κολοκύνθη* as a name for the *phallus*. That Greek, in particular, was extraordinarily rich in vulgar names for the *pudenda* is notorious. Three Pompeian inscriptions furnish evidence that Latin acquired from Greek the sense of *colocyntha* or *colocyntha* here postulated. These are:

- (1) C.I.L. iv. 2887 'quintio siqui recusat assidat ad asinum [I]ic[et]', where a metrically sound *septenarius* is to be restored by the transposition 'quintio siqui recusat, ad asinum assidat licet'.

¹ For the signification of *barbata* see Mart. x. 90, 1-10 quoted by Housman, ad loc. The woman is not *παρὰτελειμένη*.

² They have treated similarly the word *quintio*, as to which *vide infra*. The spelling *χειλειδών* for *χελιδών* is vulgar. The substitution of *ει* for *ι* is found occasionally in Pompeian inscriptions, as in C.I.L. iv. 2411 a 'Αφροδείτη = -δίτη and iv. 733 *καλλόεικος* = -εικος; but since *ει* for *ι* appears to be unexampled, I suggest that the first *ει*, if the *ι* is genuine and not an acciden-

tal chip in the stone, is a slip due to anticipation of the second *ει*, or alternatively that it represents the sound which in the vulgar Latin of the graffiti is variously written as *δ* or *ι*: for *ει* representing *δ* or *ι* one may cite C.I.L. iv. 6828 *πυθαιικός* = *publicus* and 4839 *ειδίας* = *ιδίας*. At any rate the word is a spelling of *χελιδών*, all that concerns us here.

³ It seems likely that the phallic shape of the gourd suggested the medical use of which Hippocrates writes.

- (2) Ib. 4977 'quintio hic futuit ceuentes et uidit qui doluit', where the original *septenarius* must surely have had not *doluit* but *noluit*: either the scribe misquoted or Mau read a disfigured and mutilated N as D.
- (3) Ib. 4989, where I read from Mau's tracing
]POPIDIVS QVI[]
]L. POPIDIVS QVINTIO[
] (POPIDIVS) QVIN[].

In the first line of this, Mau, misled by the existence at Pompeii of a Popidius Rufus, read RV[FVS] for a perfectly plain QVI[NTIO]; the third line, of which Mau made nothing at all, exhibits a quite legible QVIN[TIO]; the marks shown in the tracing after the break in the surface at the end of ll. 2 and 3 do not resemble letters and are manifestly accidental scratches. It appears, then, that in this graffito L. Popidius, a distinguished citizen of Pompeii, is thrice called a *quintio*, a quip suggested not only by malice but also by the fact that his true cognomen was *Secundus*; Mau takes *Quintio* as a genuine cognomen and enters L. Popidius Quintio in his *Index Nominum*.

In the first two of these inscriptions evidently, and consequently in the third also, *quintio* means *uir memerosus*, a man *ad futuendum uel pedicandum aptissimus*. Its termination is that found in *lucurio* and the like, and its stem is derived from (*colo*)*quinta*, another spelling of (*colo*)*cynt(h)a*. The word *colocynt(h)a* is known to the *Thesaurus* in only one (late) occurrence other than that now under discussion, if one except Porph. *ad* Hor. *A.P.* 52-3 where, in an etymology, the Greek form *κολοκύνθη* is transliterated—evidence, perhaps, that the common Greek form in its Latin use was obscene and for that reason avoided. But *colocynt(h)s* and *colocynt(h)ida* occur frequently, and, as the *Thesaurus* notes, 'confunduntur in codd. et edit. passim formae -*cynt(h)s* et -*quintis*, -*cynt(h)ida* et -*quintida*', an assertion amply confirmed by the examples cited s.v. *colocynt(h)s*. It can scarcely be doubted that *colocynt(h)a* also, when written at all, was spelt, in popular usage, with -*quint-*, the spelling to the late occurrence of which the French *coloquinte* is a witness. Thus, if the argument is sound, both *colocynt(h)a* (or *coloquinta*) and *quinta* (whence *quintio*) acquired the meaning *mentula*.¹ The further development, *colocynt(h)a* = *uir memerosus*, is matched by similar use of *mentula* and *uerpa*. For *mentula* it is enough to refer to the nickname *Mentula* in Catullus, and to Mart. ix. 63 'ad cenam inuitant omnes te, Phoebe, cinaedi. | *mentula* quem pascit, non, puto, purus homo est'. In literature, so far as I have observed, *uerpa* always has the strict sense of *membrum uirile*, but in a number of Pompeian graffiti it evidently means a *pedico*. Since this sense of *uerpa* seems not to have been noted, I record the following certain examples:

- (1) *C.I.L.* iv. 4876: 'Regulo feliciter quia uerpa est.'
 (2) Ib. 1884: the *senarius* (Buech. *Carm. Epigr.* 46) 'qui uerpam uissit, quid cenasse illum putes?' (cf. Mart. ii. 51. 5 *conuiuia culi* and ix. 63 quoted above).
 (3) Ib. 2415 (with Zangemeister's note, p. 223): 'Tertiani hic abitant. Cresces uerpa ua(le).'
 (4) Ib. 1655: 'Hysochryse puer, Natalis uerpa te salutat'² (cf. ib. 4082 *Natalis cin(a)edus est*).

¹ It seems possible that this development was helped by popular etymology, through association of *colo-*, in spite of the difference of quantity, with *cōlis* or *cōlus* = *membrum uirile*. I note in passing that the word *coloso*, occurring only, and without context, in *C.I.L.* iv. 4799, is probably derived from this as an equivalent of *memerosus*; the *Thesaurus* enters it, tentatively, under

colossus. (The irregularity of the last letter, as shown in Mau's copy, suggests that the graffito had suffered injury at that point and that the scribe may have written the nominative *colossus*.)

² Lommatzsch, mistaking this for a dactylic hexameter spoilt by an intrusive *te*, includes it as No. 1938 in his Supplement to Buecheler's *Carmina Epigraphica*, but the occurrence in

(5) M
F
t
s
it of the
(= Isoch
composit
proximat
uneducat
spelling K
in the ex
Lommatz

UNIVE

Alcaeus of
Campbell
Cucurbita
Delphic o
Ehrenber
14 ff.
Fletcher,
Gow, A.
id. xxv
'Hρακλῆς
Murray,
Comedy
New Com
Parke, H
oracle,
Parthenio
Pfeiffer,
Philip V,
1 ff.
Plutarch

Aelius La
Com
Aeschylu
Agas
Cho.
Pers
P.V.
Sept
Alcman:
fr. 7
Amnian
xxii
Anth. Pa
vi (1
3:
4:
Antiphar
(fr.
Apolloni
ii (7
Apuleius
Met.
Aratus:
Vii.
Aristoph
The

- (5) *Notizie degli Scavi* 1939, p. 261, n. 130, where for Della Corte's meaningless P. PROPESICYNIVS VERPA (e)S QVI ISTVC LEGES NON ES FIDENTER SCRIPTO I read 'Popidius Secundus. uerpa es qui istuc legēs (= legis). non es pedicator, scripture.' In this graffito *uerpa* and *pedicator* are synonymous; *scripte* = 'Popidi Secunde cuius nomen scriptum est.'

it of the two Pompeian names Hysochrysus (= Isochrysus) and Natalis, implying an original composition of the scribe, shows that the approximation to verse is accidental. Vulgar and uneducated Pompeian scribes (note the misspelling *Hysochryse*) do not attempt composition in the exotic quantitative metres. Heraeus, says Lommatzsch, took *uerpa* in the familiar sense of

membrum uirile and made of *Natalis* a genitive; no doubt he would not have done so had he known the other sense of the word. In case any should think that *Hysochryse puer* has a poetical ring, I cite the Pompeian graffito *Not. d. Scav.*, 1939, p. 262, n. 135 *Eucapa puer ua(le)*, where there is no suggestion of verse.

F. A. TODD.

UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY.

INDEXES

I. GENERAL INDEX

- Alcaeus of Messene, Philip V, and Rome (*concluded*), 1 ff.
 Campbell, A. Y., five passages in Sophocles, 33 ff.
Cucurbitaceae in Latin literature, some, 101 ff.
 Delphic oracle, the days for consulting the, 19 ff.
 Ehrenberg, V., an early source of Polis-constitution, 14 ff.
 Fletcher, G. B. A., Tacitea, 90 ff.
 Gow, A. S. F., 'Ἡρακλῆς Λεοντοφόνος' (Theocritus *id.* xxv), 93 ff.
 'Ἡρακλῆς Λεοντοφόνος', 93 ff.
 Murray, Gilbert, ritual elements in the New Comedy, 46 ff.
 New Comedy, ritual elements in the, 46 ff.
 Parke, H. W., the days for consulting the Delphic oracle, 19 ff.
 Parthenios' *Arete*, a fragment of, 23 ff.
 Pfeiffer, R., a fragment of Parthenios' *Arete*, 23 ff.
 Philip V, Alcaeus of Messene, and Rome (*concluded*), 1 ff.
 Plutarch *Lycurgus VI*, the Spartan *Rhetra* in, 62 ff.
 Polis-constitution, an early source of, 14 ff.
 Polybius on the Roman constitution, 73 ff.
 Reynolds, R. W., criticism of individuals in Roman popular comedy, 37 ff.
 Richardson, L. J. D., 'Υπηρέτης, 55 ff.
 Roman constitution, Polybius on the, 73 ff.
 Roman popular comedy, criticism of individuals in, 37 ff.
 Sophocles, five passages in, 33 ff.
 Spartan *Rhetra* in Plutarch *Lycurgus VI*, 62 ff.
 Tacitea, 90 ff.
 Theocritus *Id.* xxv, 93 ff.
 Todd, F. A., some *Cucurbitaceae* in Latin literature, 101 ff.
 'Υπηρέτης, 55 ff.
 Wade-Gery, H. T., the Spartan *Rhetra* in Plutarch *Lycurgus VI*, 62 ff.
 Walbank, F. W., Alcaeus of Messene, Philip V, and Rome (*concluded*), 1 ff.; Polybius on the Roman constitution, 73 ff.

II. INDEX OF PASSAGES

- Aelius Lampridius:
Com. (1), (3-4), 43.
 Aeschylus:
Agam. (52), 60.
Cho. (999), 29.
Pers. (574-5), 65.
P.V. (927), 69.
Sept. (427-8), 69.
 Alcman:
 fr. 76 (Bergk⁴), 48.
 Ammianus Marcellinus:
 xxii (8, 14), 27.
 Anth. Pal.:
 vi (171, 3-4), 8; (247), 1 ff.; (412), 12; ix (519), 3; (588), 12; xi (12), 3, 10; (39), 108; xii (50), 4; xvi (5), 2.
 Antiphanes:
 (fr. 220 K.), 99.
 Apollonius Rhodius:
 ii (745), 28.
 Apuleius:
Met. i (5-19), 102; (15), 101; v (9), 102.
 Aratus:
Vid. i (p. 55), 32.
 Aristophanes:
Thesm. (950-1), 67.
 Aristotle:
 (fr. 592), 16.
Pol. (1272b 3 ff.), 16; (1272b 25, 26, 33), (1273a 5, 6), 71; (1273a 6-8), 69.
 Augustine:
de Civ. Dei ii (9), 38.
 Bacchylides:
 v (73, 107), 100.
 Callisthenes:
 [F. Gr. Hist. 124 F 1], 20.
 Capitolinus:
Max. duo, ix (2-5), 44.
M. Ant. phil. (8), (29), 43.
Verus (7-4), 43.
 Cercidas:
 fr. 4 (47-8), 12.
 Choricus of Gaza:
Apol. Mimorum (120-1), 45.
 Cicero:
ad Att. i (16, 11), 39; vii (2, 1), 28; ix (13), 61; xiv (2), (3), 39.
ad Fam. vii (11, 2), 38.
de Rep. iv (10), 38.
pro Sest. (115), 39.
 C.I.L. iv (1388), 109; (1655), (1884), (2415), 110; (2498), (2887), 109; (3948), 101; (4196), 109; (4876), (4977), (4989), 110.

- Demosthenes:
Ol. i (17), 5; ii (19), 37.
- Dio Cassius:
Epit. ix (35), 103.
- Diodorus:
 xxi (16. 4), 65; xxviii (3), 4; xxxii (2), (4), 87.
- Diogenes Laertius:
 ix (8. 9), 32.
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus:
 v (46), 99.
- Ennius:
Ann. ix (14); x (i), 6.
- Eusebius:
Præp. Ev. x (3. 23) [Porphyry], 10.
- Eustathius:
 p. 528 (43), p. 1910 (10), 6.
- Festus:
 [317 Linds.], 39.
- Herodotus:
 vi (57. 2), 68.
- Hesychius:
 (ed. Schmidt, 2200, 26), 6.
- Homer:
Il. viii (167-8), 69.
Od. ix (290), (296 f.), (361), 4; (370), 5; (489), (490), 57; xii (194), 57; xxi (295-8), 4.
- Horace:
Ep. i (6. 54), 103.
- Inscr. Græc.:
I.G. iv. i (590, l. 5), 5; iv. 2 (i. 590), 9; v. i (1144, 1146), 66; (1155), 69.
- Juvenal:
 iv (107), 6; v (9), 103; (127-9), 109; vii (115 ff.), 102; viii (173-8), 108; (196-7), 43; xiv (58), 101.
Oxf. frag. vi (365¹ ff.), 108.
- Laberius:
 [88 Ribbeck], 38.
- Livy:
 iv (25. 9), 90; xxiii (11. i ff.), 20; xxvii (45. 10-11), 91; xxxiv (32. 13), (50. 9), 8; xxxv (5. 6), 91; xiv (7. 3), 5.
- Martial:
 iv (14. 7), v (84. 3 ff.), 106; ix (63), 110; xi (92), 105; xii (74. 9, 10), 108; (83), 102; xiv (16), 106.
- Nonnus:
 D. 41 (365), 27.
- Orosius:
adv. pag. vi (22. 4), 40.
- Ovid:
Met. xv (82), 91.
- Parthenios:
 [p. 43. 8 Mart.], 32.
- Petronius:
Sat. 37 (3), 109; 39 (12), 101; 44 (7), 105; 62 (13), 109; 67 (1-2), 105; 82 (2), 94.
- Photius:
cod. 37 (p. 8a, 2 f.), 85.
- Pindar:
Ol. i (52), 70.
Pyth. iv (138), (156), 71.
- Plato:
Phædo (58B), 67.
Rep. (474E), 34.
Theæt. (154B), 34.
- Pliny:
N.H. xi (6), 90; xix (24. 69), 101; (24. 71-3), 107.
- Plutarch:
Agis (xi. 1), 69.
Alex. (14), 19, 21.
Aristides (xi. 3 ff.), 20.
Flam. ix (1), 2, (2), i f.; xii (6), 8.
Lycurgus vi (passim), 62 ff.
Mor. (292 E), 19; (389 c), 21; (398 A), 19; (414 B), 22.
Philop. (xi. 2), 9.
qu. Conv. (8. 3. 8), 51.
qu. Græc. (5), 16.
qu. Rom. (52), 16.
- Polybius:
 ii (3. 8), 79; (21. 8), 85; (41. 5, 6), 89; (43. 8), 76; (44. 3, 6), 77; (48. 2, 4), 11; iii (2.6), 88; vi (3. 1-2, 6), 80; (3. 9), 79, 80; (3. 9, 10), (4. 2), 77; (4. 6, 7), (5. 9, 10), (6. 12), (7), 78; (8. 1, 2), 79; (9. 12-14), 74; (9. 16), 78; (10), 77; (10. 1-2), 81; (10. 7, 11), 74; (10. 14), 74, 81; (11. 1), 74; (11. 11), (12. 9), 77; (47. 1), 81; (47. 7), 82; (51. 3-8), (57), 74; (57. 4), 81; (57. 9), 86; vii. 13 (7), 4; viii (8. 4), 77; 9 (13), 6; x (26. 2), xi (13. 5-8), 77; xii (250. 3), 80; xv (21. 2), 77; xviii. 14 (6), 9; xxxvi (9), 87; xxxviii (1. 5), 87.
- Porphyry, *see* Eusebius.
- Scholiarist:
Ap. Rh. i (955/60e), 27.
Dem. [Dindorf], viii (100), 37.
Hom. Il. xviii (486), 32.
Hor. Sat. ii (7. 15), 106.
Juv. xiv (5), 106.
Pind. I. ii (68), 28.
Thuc. i (67. 3), 67.
- Seneca:
Apocol. (5. 2), 104; (13), 105; (14-15), 104; (15), 106.
De Clem. i (25. 1), 91.
Dial. iv (11. 3), 39; xii (19. 6), 40.
Octavia (243-4), 90.
- Sophocles:
Ai. (542), 36.
O.C. (1416-23), 34 ff.
O.T. (114-19), 33; (702), 33 f.; (706), 34.
Phil. (328), 33; (519), (875), 34; (952), 36.
- Strabo:
 xii (565), 27.
- Suetonius:
Aug. (53), (68), 40.
Cal. (27), 41.
Claud. (3. 2), 103; (30), 104; (33), 105.
Dom. (3. 1), (10. 4), 42.
Galba (13), 41.
Nero (39. 3), 41.
Tib. (45), 41; (57. 2), 40.
Vesp. (19), 40.
- Suidas:
s.v. Ἀπατος, 32.
s.v. Ἡλιδος, 32.
s.v. Θεόκριτος, 32.
s.v. Παρθένιος, 28, 30.
- Tacitus:
Ann. i (31. 4), (36. 1), (42. 4), (62. 1), 90; iii (57. 1), 90; iv (14), 91; (41. 1), (70. 3), 90; xi (30. 1), 90; xii (51. 3), 90; xiv (37. 1), (52. 2), 91; xv (40. 1), (63. 3), 91.
Hist. i (57. 2), (64. 2), (84. 3), 91; ii (4. 2), 90; (5), 40; (48. 2), 91; iii (23. 2), 91; iv (46. 2), (63. 1), 91.
- Terence:
H.T. (876 f.), 105.
- Theocritus:
 xiii (57), 99; xxv (27), 98; (63), 99; (157), 98; (164), 99; (201), 100; (207), (255), 99.
- Theognis:
 (349), 4.
- Theophrastus:
C.P. i (13. 3), 108; v (17. 2), 99.
- Theopompus:
 [Polyb. viii. 9. 13], 6.
- Thucydides:
 i (87. 2), 65; ii (64. 3), 76; iv (118. 9), v (111. 5), 69.
- Timotheus:
Persæ (1), 9.
- Trebonius Pollio:
Gallieni duo (7-9), 44.
- Virgil:
Aen. i (301), v (15), 60; x (294), 57.
- Xenophon:
Cyneg. xii (18), 70.
Cyrop. vii (1. 6), 70.
Oec. 16 (13), 17 (12, 14), 98.

76;
88;
109;
78;
78;
74;
2. 9),
(57),
, 4;
5-8),
xviii.
7.

104;

, 90;
o. 3),
37. 1),

, 90;
46. 2),

7), 98;

III. 5),

y

BLACKWELLS of OXFORD

BOOKSELLERS

are always ready to buy secondhand books
in large lots or small

48-51 BROAD STREET, OXFORD

THE HIBBERT JOURNAL

A Quarterly Review of Religion, Theology, and Philosophy

Edited by L. P. JACKS

April 1943 Contents

1. THE WHITE PAPER ON EDUCATION. Principal John Hurray and M. L. Jacks
2. CIVILIZATION—A BLESSING OR A CURSE? Hamilton Fyfe
3. THE SPIRITUAL EQUILIBRIUM OF EAST AND WEST. Melville Channing-Pearce
4. THE PHILOSOPHY OF REVELATION. Father Cuthbert Latley, S.J.
5. THE BICENTENARY OF THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION. W. Forbes Gray
6. THE SPIRITUAL EQUILIBRIUM OF EAST AND WEST. M. Channing-Pearce
7. THE NEW WITCH-HUNT. D. L. Hobman
8. KIERKEGAARD ON FAITH. G. W. Griffith
9. THE CHRISTOCRATIC CHURCH. Canon H. G. England
10. THE ORIGIN OF THE GOSPELS. H. S. Shelton

SUBSCRIPTION: TEN SHILLINGS NET PER ANNUM, POST FREE

Apply for free specimen copy

GEORGE ALLEN AND UNWIN LIMITED

40 MUSEUM ST., LONDON WC1

CISALPINE GAUL

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC HISTORY FROM 49 B.C. TO
THE DEATH OF TRAJAN

By G. E. F. CHILVER

17s. 6d. net

'This book is a model of a sober and honest study of Roman Italy.'—

Prof. A. MOMIGLIANO in the *Journal of Roman Studies*

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

